

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom
all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXVII

OCTOBER, 1933

No. 160

EDITORIAL

PASTOR IN PAROCHIA

IN a notice published below of the late Bishop of Jarrow's book *Fulfilling the Ministry*, the Rev. C. C. James expresses decided views on the question of house-to-house visitation; and these views are so widely shared, and the issue so important, that we propose to consider them briefly in our editorial notes for this month. The subject is timely, moreover, because many of our readers who have parochial cures will be now beginning to embark on their winter work, and in making their plans will find themselves almost certainly confronted with the question in one form or another. Its urgency will, of course, vary in different circumstances. In the country parish, if it is really rural and not suburban, it is possible for the parish priest to know all his people and to think of them as members of one family, and to visit the lapsed no less than the faithful. The picture of Keble at his work in Hursley contained in the Bishop of Winchester's sermon, which we published in THEOLOGY last month, represents an ideal which in country parishes is practicable: the flock is not too big for the priest to collect the stragglers (or at least try to do so) as well as to shepherd the main body. And when this is practicable, few would dispute its desirability. Not that the stragglers may not be very obdurate: we once heard a country parson tell how it was only after twenty years of intercession that he had the joy of seeing one of his parishioners repent of a hardened hatred towards a member of his family which was keeping him from all practice of religion. But in the village the priest can know the people and their histories with sufficient intimacy for each individual to be his particular care; and he has the time to be patient and to pray.

But is a similar policy possible in urban parishes? Mr. James answers decidedly, No. If the priest is to get round to every house, he can give to each so short a time that the visit is useless from a spiritual point of view. The work of the clergy, in his view, should be that of building up and of inspiring the faithful, and thus of getting the Church to do the drawing-in of others rather than of trying to do it himself. His work for the lapsed and the unbelieving is to be indirect rather than direct.

To a great extent we agree with Mr. James, but with two reservations to which we will come in a moment. It needs first, however, to be observed that even in urban parishes much depends on the size of the clerical staff: where there are assistant clergy, it is obvious that the range of possible visiting is correspondingly increased. That said, we will come to the two conditions which seem to need emphasis—as Mr. James would, no doubt, agree—if the more intensive policy which he advocates is to be justified. One is that the *aim* of the intensive teaching, worship, and work should always be kept in mind, namely the building-up of the whole household of God. Sir Henry Hadow once defined poetry as of two kinds—the poetry of acceptance (*e.g.*, Milton, Gray, Wordsworth, Matthew Arnold), and the poetry of escape (*e.g.*, Byron, Shelley). A similar distinction is often found in religion, though in this case the two kinds are of very different value. There is a certain type of mind, it must be admitted, to which religious observance is very largely an escape from the realities of life into the unrealities of feeling; and where this finds reflexion in the mind of the priest himself, the result is almost inevitably the formation of a small clique of pious worshippers who absorb all his attention. We get, in fact, what has been called “the religion of the sacristy.” But the religion of Christ, and the worship in which it finds expression, is essentially a religion of acceptance. It begins with the acceptance of God’s judgment and forgiveness—with the Cross, in fact; and it continues in the acceptance of the will of Him *cui servare est regnare*. There is a cross, a yoke, to be borne even in the highest moments of praise and thanksgiving: He whom we adore is ever “marching on” to the redemption of the world He came to save. The edification of the faithful, therefore, is always conditioned, so long as it is rooted in truth, by the will of God that all men—even the unfaithful—should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.

The second point which we think should be emphasized is the importance of corporate bodies in the life of urban parishes. The parish priest cannot visit the numberless individual homes

in his parish, and might well waste much time if he did: but he can very often touch a large proportion of them through close contact with the authorities of various organizations which touch the lives of these homes at various times. Schools are an obvious case in point, with their staffs of teachers, inspectors, and committees. Hospitals are another. And the list could be greatly increased; so that, if the priest is working closely with responsible people in these various directions, he will in fact be exercising a very important spiritual influence on the lives of hundreds whom he does not know. And one of the encouraging features of English life today is the large number of men and women engaged in public service who derive their inspiration from the Church and the Christian faith.

We desire to bespeak careful and widespread attention for Fr. Hebert's article printed below. It meets all the objections which we have often urged in these columns against the Canon of 1928, and seems to us to represent the best spirit of Catholic and Anglican scholarship, which seeks to transcend opposite views by including all that is most true in both. We believe that the form proposed by Fr. Hebert would command the assent of the whole Church.

THE FATHER'S NAME

A STUDY IN NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Thy Nature and Thy Name is Love.—CHARLES WESLEY.

THE appellation "Father" as applied to God was by no means unfamiliar to the Jews of our Lord's day; and its history is instructive. Two points especially are to be observed. The first is that it clearly arose out of Israel's historical experience and the interpretation of God's part in it which the prophets taught them. The second is that, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, the term is used of God only when His relation to the whole people Israel, or to some actual or ideal king of Israel, is in mind.

1. That the conception of the divine Fatherhood took shape from Israel's experience of God's relationship to them is clear from the passages in the Old Testament, all of them post-prophetic, where the term occurs. It is because they have come to see in the events of their history, and not least in its painful and disastrous events, a father's hand that they learn to call Him their Father. The word owes nothing to the idea of physical descent from God* which was so marked a feature of paganism: indeed, the Jew eschewed it for that reason. Rather it connotes all that is meant by the Latin word *cura*—the care, responsibility, discipline, love which a father shows to his children. And God has shown these qualities to Israel in the ordering of their history—in their peculiar vocation to be *His* people,† in His repeated deliverance of them,‡ in His moral guidance given or promised to them,§ in His compassionate care of them.|| The learning of such a lesson naturally took time: the realization of moral and spiritual relationships is always a slow and gradual process, and we need not therefore be surprised that the divine Name which connoted the closest and most personal of all the relationships in which Israel stood to God should appear comparatively late in the nation's history.¶ That very gradualness in its coming accounts in no small degree for the richness of its meaning, when it comes.

2. Yet Israel never passed, in *the period covered by the Old Testament*, to the idea of God as the Father of the individual Israelite. It is the people as a whole which is God's son, not each member of it: David's words, "Blessed be thou, Lord God

* Mal. ii. 10 ("Have we not all one father?") is sometimes interpreted in this sense. But the allusion to Abraham seems more probable (cf. St. John viii. 33 ff.).

† Deut. xxxii. 6.

‡ Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8.

§ Jer. xxxi. 9 (cf. 1 Thess. iii. 11).

|| Ps. ciii. 13, lxviii. 5.

¶ Cf. Adam Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, i. 454.

of Israel, our father, for ever and ever,"* were not individualized, even within Israel itself, except in regard to Israel's representative, the king or the Messiah. Here, it is true, there is a change of usage: David and David's successors—above all, the expected Messiah—could call God their Father individually.† It is not too much, indeed, to say that in this individual sense the name Father is Messianic. The Messiah would be one who was in a peculiar way "the son of God," and he would properly call upon God as his own Father. The fact provides a vital clue to the understanding of our Lord's language in the Gospels.

GOD AS FATHER IN JUDAISM

When we pass from the Old Testament, however, to the Apocryphal literature and the Rabbinic teaching, we observe a change. Thus, in his beautiful prayer for self-control—a prayer which served Lancelot Andrewes as a model for many of his "Deprecations"—the Son of Sirach calls upon God as "O Lord, Father, and God of my life."‡ A century or more later the Book of Wisdom—a book deeply influenced by Greek ideas—reflects the idea, then becoming common, that the righteous man had a special title to call God his Father and himself a son of God.§ From this it is no great step to the use of the term found in the teaching of the Rabbis. In this teaching the word has become part of Jewish *cultus*, and belongs to the worshipping community in its approach to God. With the singular pronoun ("my" or "thy") it is exceedingly rare:|| and Rabbi Judah ben Tema's saying, "Be strong as a leopard, light as an eagle, fleet as a hart, and strong as a lion to do the will of thy Father who is in heaven,"¶ may be as late as A.D. 200. The reluctance to use the singular was perhaps due to motives of reverence; but it may equally be claimed that it was due to the Jew's sense of solidarity with the worshipping community,** in which he merged his own individuality. "Our Father," on the other hand, is common. And it marks an advance on earlier usage: for the community in mind is not the whole nation of Israel, but rather the *Hasidim* or "pious ones."†† It belongs to the prayer of a church, that is to say, rather than of a nation;

* 1 Chron. xxix. 10.

† Ps. ii. 7, lxxxix. 26.

‡ Ecclus. xxiii. 1.

§ Wisd. ii. 16, v. 5; cf. Ps. Sol. xvii. 27; St. John viii. 41; Ecclus. iv. 10, li. 10 (Heb.); Wisd. xiv. 3; 3 Macc. vi. 4.

|| Cf. Dr. Lukyn Williams' paper in *J.T.S.*, xxxi., No. 121, p. 44. Its facts are accepted by Dr. Montefiore, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching*, p. 129.

¶ *Pirge Aboth*, v. 23.

** Cf. Montefiore, *op. cit.*, pp. 128, 129.

†† Cf. Kohler, *Jewish Theology*, p. 257.

and it rests on the conviction that "only righteousness or personal merit entitles a man to be called a son of God."*

The point is of great importance. We have reached the high-water mark of the Jewish preparation for Christ's revelation of the Father; and both its resemblances and its contrasts deserve attention. To many it will come as a surprise to realize that the opening invocation of the Lord's Prayer was a phrase not unknown in Jewish worship, at least in certain circles. In the New Testament, moreover, except on the lips of the Lord Himself, the word "Father" is not often used with the singular pronoun; though the word "Abba," which St. Paul claims as characteristic of the Christians' relationship to God,† should probably be translated "my Father." But it would be true to say that in the New Testament, as in the Rabbinic teaching, the term is a cult-form, and belongs to the worshipping community. In Judaism, again, as in the Gospels, the divine transcendence is emphasized by the mention of "heaven" as the Father's dwelling-place. It is when we look deeper, however, to the foundations on which the usage rests, that we see the difference between Judaism and Christianity. What underlies the phrase on Jewish lips? It is piety. The old historical ground appealed to by the prophets as the proof of God's Fatherhood has been tacitly abandoned; and its place has been taken by the religious emotion of the devout worshipper and the sense of privilege which his virtuous observance of the Law imparts to him. In other words, the foundation is mysticism. In the New Testament, on the other hand, the prophetic tradition is recovered, and the foundation is historical. It lies in what God has done, and done not long ago, but recently, in the sending of His only-begotten Son, the Christ, to take away sin and establish His kingdom among men. Christ Himself, as the Son of God, in His own right called on Him as Father: Christians, by virtue of having believed in Christ and received His Spirit, are entitled to do the like. But it was always God's act in Christ, sent, crucified, and raised from the dead, which underlay the relationship. Further, since in Christ alone lies justification, all thought of merit in the worshipper has disappeared, and its place been taken by the forgiveness of sins. Finally, the Church which confesses the divine Fatherhood is no longer limited to Judaism, but has a universal scope and range, embracing all mankind without distinction of race or sex or condition. We may sum up, therefore, by saying that, while the most character-

* Kohler, *op. cit.*, p. 258. Yet the distinction between the *Hasidim* and Israel must not be overpressed; they were the representative and spear-head of Israel on the God-ward side.

† Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6.

istic expression used by Jesus and the Apostolic writers, when speaking of the Father, was taken over from Judaism, it was given a new content; for it was based on new facts pregnant with a new relationship between God and man.

THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING

Some justification is needed for proceeding at once to the meaning of the Father's Name in the Church of the first century instead of concentrating first upon the revelation of it in our Lord's own teaching. Yet there are reasons which make this course more convenient. It is true that in historical sequence our Lord's teaching follows next upon that of Judaism; and also that it is the fountain-head of all that the early Church believed about the Father. On the other hand, it is no less true that there are problems raised by what the Gospels record of our Lord's teaching which are only soluble, or at least most easily solved, when we take into account the teaching of the first century to which it gave rise. A tree is known not by its roots, but by its fruits; and Christ's revelation of the Father cannot be seen in its proper proportion and significance except in the setting of what it led to no less than of what gave rise to it.

Any study of the New Testament doctrine which claims to be scientific has to account for the beliefs which were taught by the Apostolic writers of the first century, and presumably accepted in the Church of their day; and to interpret the recorded teaching of Jesus in a way which establishes no intelligible relation between that and the teaching of the Apostles is to get both out of focus. There should be less danger of this, if we consider first the Apostolic faith, all the more since its main outlines are simple and clear.

Perhaps the most significant fact in the testimony of the Apostolic writers is their use of certain well-established phrases or *formulae* in which the Father is named. First to be noted is the phrase "God Father" or "God and Father." It occurs no fewer than forty times, which is more than half the number of times that the word "Father" is used of God in the Epistles; and it is used by every writer of the Epistles, with the exception of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Sometimes the term is qualified by the genitive, "our," expressing God's relation to the Church as a whole; sometimes by the genitive of "Jesus Christ," whose Father He was in a unique sense.* Even when no genitive qualifies the phrase, one or both of these is commonly implied. It is clear that we are dealing with a

* The evidence is marshalled with his usual thoroughness by Hort in his Commentary on 1 St. Pet. i. 2.

belief already so fixed in expression, so widespread in the Church, and so authoritatively used, as to deserve the name of dogma.

The collocation of the words "God" and "Father" in the formula is, moreover, highly significant. The Christian writer is evidently unwilling to dispense with either; each is felt to require the other, and their combination to represent a cardinal element of the Christian revelation. What that truth was has been so well described by Hort that we may well make use of his words:*

"There is, indeed, nothing surprising in this expression of both relations in Scripture. To Jews and Greeks alike the idea expressed by the name *God* would be more comprehensive than the idea expressed by the name *Father*; summing up all such subordinate ideas as those of *Maker* and *Ruler*, it would suggest God's relation to the universe and all its constituent parts, not to that part of it alone which is capable of sonship. Now the revelation of Fatherhood which was given in the Son of God was assuredly not meant to supersede the more universal name. He whom men had securely learned to know as their Father did not cease to be their God, or to be the God of the world of which they formed a part and in which they moved; and this relation was a primary and fundamental one, independent of the intrusion of evil. It is therefore difficult to see how either relation could have been absent from a perfect Manhood. Conversely a renovation and expansion of the whole idea of God as the God of men and the God of His whole creation is involved in the Incarnation, as seen under these larger aspects under which it came at last to present itself to the Apostles."

Equal significance attaches to the particular use of this *formula* in the phrase "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The designation is confined to initial benedictions or thanksgivings, or other passages of special solemnity, and it is used both by St. Paul and by St. Peter. Both the designation itself and its setting are important. Benediction played a large part in Jewish life and religion. "The dignifying of man's relationship to the world of time and space could be achieved by means of the realization, quickened constantly through the habitual use of innumerable blessings, of the relationship in which both he and the whole of the world stood toward the Eternal Creator of all."† The form and number of such blessings were strictly fixed in Rabbinic lore, and by the second century B.C. deviations were held to render a blessing invalid. A blessing was therefore in the strictest sense a *formula*.

The essence of Jewish benediction was that, through the invocation of the divine Name, divine power was released. The form best known to us was that which we should call "saying Grace"—with this difference, that the meal was not blessed,

* *Op. cit.*, on 1 St. Pet. i. 3.

† Gavin, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, pp. 63, 64.

but God, whose power was thereby believed to be set free for the sanctifying of the food. Thus, at the *Kiddush*, or supper on the Sabbath eve, the blessings for bread and wine were, "Blessed art thou, O Lord our Lord, who bringest forth bread from the earth," and "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who dost create the fruit of the vine."* A further point to be observed is that from the days of the second Temple onwards the Jews shrank more and more from using the Name of God Himself in such blessings, the word *Adonai* being substituted.

It was to readers trained in, or familiar with, such Jewish formularies that the Apostles addressed their letters with the magnificent benediction, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." They kept the form of the Jewish blessing deliberately; but in its content broke through all the old conventions. So far from fearing to name the divine Name, they blazon it out in the forefront of their epistles; and they have no fear that its novelty will make it invalid. Nothing could show more plainly than the use of this formula how deeply and fervently the Apostles believed themselves to be the witnesses to, and spokesmen of, a new revelation. It is indeed God Himself who has broken through the mists and webs of tradition, and declared His Name afresh. When we turn to the content of the Christian blessing, the facts are no less impressive. The name involved is that of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." God is conceived, that is to say, in relation to an historical Person (Jesus), who is the object of a formulated faith (Christ), and the centre of a spiritual kingdom and worship (our Lord). It would be difficult to compose a phrase more expressive of the fact that the revelation of the Father was historically mediated and controlled. He is the God and Father of the Man Jesus, who lived in Palestine and "went about doing good," and was crucified and rose again. This same Jesus was also the Christ, who had been designated by a voice from heaven as God's beloved or only-begotten Son, and who in virtue of His divine Sonship called upon God as His Father. And He was likewise "our Lord"—Lord, because He had been exalted to God's right hand and crowned with glory and honour, and yet *our* Lord, because through His Spirit Christians believed in Him and knew Him and loved Him and centred in Him their worship.

The point receives still further emphasis in the descriptive clauses which follow and amplify the Name. Here He is the "Father of mercies and God of all consolation," who enables us

* For the bearing of this on the origins of the Eucharist, cf. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, pp. 167 ff.; and for the connexion of *εὐλογία* and *εὐχαριστία*, Gavin, *op. cit.*, pp. 69 ff.

to show to one another through Christ an abounding compassion like that which was shown to us in Christ's sufferings.* In another passage† the emphasis is laid on the Christians' election to the holy and blameless life of sonship which results from the redemption freely given to them by the Father through the blood of His dear Son. In the First Epistle of St. Peter‡ God is blessed especially for the new and glorious hope which He has given to believers through Christ's resurrection. What the Apostolic writers say, in effect, is that God's Fatherhood has been revealed supremely in certain historical occurrences, especially in the death and resurrection of Christ, and in the grace thus opened to believers. Underlying the appellation "Father" on Christian lips there lies what William Law calls "the whole process of Christ." And the effect is decisive. Take, for example, the concluding words, the second of the "Eighteen Benedictions," which dates from the age of the Maccabees:§

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who revivest the dead"—
and set beside it St. Peter's

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"—

and the contrast is evident at once. Or again, note how the truth is expressed in St. Paul's passionate question, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"|| followed by the swift correction, as though he were in danger of isolating the Passion, "It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

"He that spared not his own Son"—there we have one of the clearest examples of how closely the theism of the New Testament is linked with its soteriology. The revelation of the Fatherhood of God is firmly based in the cross of Christ. The initiative in the Atonement is with the Father; and it is He who, at great cost, carries it through in Christ to the triumphant victory of the resurrection.¶ We must be careful as to the interpretation of the words "spared not"; we must not construe them as though they meant "punished." The words mean rather "did not withhold from death"—from that death which was the inevitable consequence of the interaction, in flesh and blood upon this earth, between the perfect obedience

* 2 Cor. i. 3 ff.

† Eph. i. 3 ff. (cf. Rev. i. 6).

‡ 1 St. Pet. i. 3 ff.

§ Kohler, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

|| Rom. viii. 32 ff.

¶ This is the theme of Professor Aulen's striking book, *Christus Victor*.

of the Son and the sin of men.* They are, in fact, explained in the following phrase, "but handed him over"—i.e., into the hands of wicked men—on our behalf. The whole sentence is thus a revelation of the Father's character as expressed in His costly giving of His own Son to suffering and death for our salvation. It is a revelation of God's love for men which has no parallel in any other religion. It is also a revelation of God's attitude to evil. He conquers it by letting it wreak its will upon His only-begotten. We are not entitled to speak of the Father "suffering" Himself. But there is an infinite and costly sympathy revealed in the saying that He spared not His own Son; and that sympathy is extended to every disciple in the trials of his faith. We are called to meet evil in the same spirit and by a like method; and to us too there is promised the Father's compassion now and a glorious resurrection at the last. It is because His sympathy is shot through with the knowledge of the end that we must ascribe to God, not suffering, but, as St. Paul does, Beatitude.

THE REVELATION IN JESUS

One of the most striking facts about the sayings in which our Lord alludes to the Father is that, while He speaks of "My Father" and of "your Father," He never speaks of "our Father," meaning "the Father of you and of me." The usage is too uniform to be accidental, and signifies that the relationship which subsisted between Christ Himself and the Father was in some way distinct and apart from that which bound His disciples or hearers to God. The distinction serves to set limits to our immediate study; and for the present we will confine ourselves to what Jesus reveals to us of the Father as His Father.

At the outset of our enquiry into the evidence of the Gospels on this point, we shall do well to take note of some statistics as to the frequency of the word "Father" in the New Testament. The figures may be summarized as follows:

1. It is used by Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels 42 times, in St. John's Gospel 107 times.
2. It is used in the remainder of the New Testament 75 times.
3. Of the 42 times when the word is used by Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, 22 are cases where the word "my" is stated or implied.
4. In over 100 of the 107 occurrences of the word on our Lord's lips in the Fourth Gospel, the relationship to Himself is stated or implied.
5. In 9 cases where St. Matthew reports our Lord as using the word "Father," the word is substituted by him for some other appellation

* So Bengel in *loc.* *φειδεδθαί* est *parcere aliis, ne intereant*. But the passages which he quotes are not as apposite as Gen. xxii. 12, which, as SH say, was probably in St. Paul's mind.

of God in his documentary sources. As a recent writer, Mr. Manson, says, "The tendency of the First Evangelist is thus to emphasize the doctrine even at the expense of literal accuracy in reporting the sayings of Jesus."* And he adds that the same tendency is to be observed operating even more powerfully in St. John.

6. In the Synoptic Gospels the term "Father" in nearly every case, and the term "my Father" in every case without exception, is used either in a prayer or when Jesus is speaking to His disciples alone. With the exception of certain controversial passages, this is broadly true of the Fourth Gospel also.

7. If the Sermon on the Mount be excluded, the great majority of Synoptic passages, where the word "Father" is used of God by Jesus, occur after St. Peter's Confession at Cæsarea Philippi.

What conclusions are to be drawn from these facts? They are, in the main, three.

(i.) Mr. Manson draws the conclusion that "in the Early Church it was recognized that 'the Father' meant a great deal more in the life and teaching of Jesus than would appear from the limited use of the name in Mark and Q."† That is a conclusion fully borne out by the evidence discussed in the preceding section of this paper; and the convergent testimony is impressive. The important result follows that the constant emphasis on the divine Fatherhood in the First and Fourth Gospels, especially in the latter, must be regarded as due to the desire of those two Evangelists to bring out clearly what appeared to them an essential element of the Gospel.

(ii.) The heart of the revelation lies in those passages where Jesus speaks of the Father as His Father. Even in the Synoptic Gospels these number more than half the total; in the Fourth Gospel they are nearly the whole number. Conclusions both negative and positive follow. On the one hand, no ground is discovered for the view that the Gospel of Jesus consists in any proclamation of "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," *except as a doctrine dependent on the Person of Christ Himself*. All the Gospels bear out the saying in St. John, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me."‡ They offer no promise and reveal no truth of God except to those who have loved and honoured the Son. As Hort says, "If the responsibility of sonship and the subjection to the Son are accepted grudgingly, still more if they are repudiated, 'coming to the

* T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 100. I am much indebted to Mr. Manson's careful study in chapter iv. of this book for the above figures. I cannot quite agree with his handling of the evidence in all cases; but the twenty-seven pages which he devotes to the subject of "God as Father" are a most valuable contribution to the study of the doctrine in the Gospels. It is obvious that in giving such statistics as these some margin must be allowed for difference of opinion as to whether a particular passage should or should not be included. But the margin is not large enough to affect the argument.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 101.

‡ xiv. 6.

Father' can be only an object of dread. Submission to the Son of God as the supreme Way, Truth, and Life is the test whether the sonship of men and the fatherhood of God are more than hazy metaphors to be whispered in moods of pathetic languor"—or, we might add, to be shouted abroad in moments of emotional rhetoric. And, on the other hand, the facts make the positive demand for a Christology. If Jesus is not the prophet of the Father, but the Son, then not His words only, but His whole experience on earth—the whole process of Christ, in short—are an essential part of His revelation of the Father. "He that hath seen me," He said, "hath seen the Father."* He did not say, "He that hath heard me," though that indeed was included in the seeing:† but "He that hath seen me." It was in His whole life and in the sum of His relations to God and to men, so far as these were manifested, that the Father was revealed.

(iii.) The rarity of Christ's utterances about the Father in the Synoptic records, and particularly in the earliest sources, and the fact that they were confined to a limited circle of hearers, is significant and requires explanation. I cannot accept Mr. Manson's contention that these utterances were confined to the latest period of the ministry: it seems to me to involve too arbitrary a handling of the Synoptic evidence, and to put too great a strain upon the crisis involved in St. Peter's Confession at Cæsarea Philippi. None the less, the facts to which Mr. Manson draws attention provide a valuable clue. Though we cannot draw a hard-and-fast line between our Lord's teaching before, and His teaching after, the event at Cæsarea, there was undoubtedly a real advance and change from that point onwards in His revelation to the disciples. And it was an advance in every aspect of His revelation, not in that of the Father only; it extended to His Messiahship, to the eschatology, to the conceptions of the kingdom and the Church, above all to the necessity and meaning of His death. The critical character of St. Peter's Confession lay in the fact that it manifested such a development in the disciples' faith and understanding as made it possible for Jesus to go on to deeper and more intimate teaching. "The mysteries of the kingdom of God"—or, in other words, the Messianic secret—had always lain beneath His deeds and words: but they had been done and spoken in parable rather than openly, so as to sift and test His hearers. Only a few had seen the underlying reality, and they only by fits and starts. St. Peter's Confession showed that one disciple at last had grasped the coherent truth behind; and the event made a starting-point for further revelation.

* St. John xiv. 9.

† Cf. St. John xii. 47, xiv. 24.

The Synoptic evidence conspires with inherent probability to suggest that such was the order of events. In the Fourth Gospel, as is well known, the sequence is much more difficult to decipher; and in any case the history is subordinated by this Evangelist to the doctrine. Yet even here traces of a development in the revelation given by our Lord are not wanting. St. John, too, records a crisis supervening close upon the feeding of a multitude—a crisis in which the Lord speaks of His approaching sacrifice, and many turn away from Him, and St. Peter declares the disciples' faith in His Messiahship. And only a little later* he records a similar crisis, as a result of which "the sheep of Jesus, within the vast fold of the theocracy, increasingly separate themselves from the body of the flock; and *I and you*, which formed the theme of ch. viii., is more and more replaced by *I and mine*, which forms a brief summary of the new situation."† It is significant that the greater part of what St. John records of our Lord's revelation of the Father falls within the chapters in which this situation is unfolded.

The conclusion to which the evidence thus points, that the truth of the divine Fatherhood was part of the Messianic secret, is confirmed by the contexts in which our Lord's allusions to it occur in the Synoptic narrative. They are all contexts that have to do with the history and doctrine of Jesus as Messiah, and reflect the Christology, soteriology, or eschatology which constitute three of the great mysteries of the kingdom of God. Leaving aside the narrative of the infancy, we observe the decisive importance of the voice at the Baptism, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased"; and its echo in the Temptation, "If thou be the Son of God. . . ." That One so designated should call God His Father follows inevitably from the designation. In the light of it we need not be surprised to find in one of the two earliest *strata* of the Gospel records the great proclamation of God's Fatherhood in the words:

"I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.

"Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.

"All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."‡

The passage is sometimes called "Johannine": but in fact there is nothing in it which is not cognate with the heavenly utterance at the Baptism. Moreover, the whole context is

* St. John x. 19-21.

† Godet, *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, ii. 397.

‡ St. Matt. xi. 25, 27.

Messianic; the preceding verses being concerned with the impending Judgment which the Messianic age will usher in, while the verses that follow reveal Jesus as Himself the Messiah already present in the flesh.*

The words of the utterance itself are not the less full of teaching because they sprang from our Lord's lips in a moment of intense exaltation and joy: their very spontaneity indeed drives home their truth. There is asserted in them a mutual relationship between Jesus and the Father which involves His investiture with the fulness of divine authority; which is unique and *sui generis*; and which can only be imparted to men through the mediation of Christ Himself. To speak, in such a connexion, of "the religious experience of Jesus" is misleading; for it suggests that our own experience of sonship to God will enable us, at least partially, to plumb the depths of His. But that is to ignore the uniqueness which He claims for the relationship, and the derivative character which He assigns to *our* knowledge of God. His knowledge of the Father was unmediated; ours is mediated through Him; and without such mediation there can be no such knowledge at all. Christ is the Revealer, because He is the incarnate Son. Hence the critical importance, for His revelation of the Father, of St. Peter's Confession at Cæsarea. His faith in Christ was still inchoate: but the first step was taken, and that step would lead not only to the Son, but to the Father also.

The voice which St. Peter and his two companions heard at the Transfiguration—"This is my beloved Son; hear Him"—set the seal upon this revelation. They saw Him then shining with the divine glory of His Sonship; and the voice that was addressed to Him at His Baptism was now addressed to them, with the added command that they were to "hear him." The command was needed after what He had said about the shame and death that awaited Him. Their discipleship was now to enter on more difficult paths; and they were to learn a fresh truth about the Father.

This fresh truth, or mystery of the kingdom, concerned Christ's redemptive mission from the Father and the method of its accomplishment. Already this had been portended in the second part of the heavenly utterance at the Baptism—"in thee I am well pleased"—words redolent of sacrifice; and St. John was but interpreting it when he made the Baptist greet our Lord as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." For the Son was to be the Servant also, by whose stripes we

* In St. Luke both the preceding and the following contexts are different from those in St. Matt., and perhaps are historically more probable. But both are no less Messianic than the Matthæan contexts.

should be healed. Both in the Synoptic Gospels and in St. John the intimations which Jesus gives of His redemptive work are closely connected with His revelation of the Father. We may turn, for example, to the occasion* when Jesus sets a child in the midst of His disciples as a living reminder of two things: first, that the Christian believer has to start His discipleship—like a child—at the beginning, with everything to learn; and, secondly, of the claim that weakness and need have upon Christians. There is no such thing as insignificance in His eyes or His Father's: the spiritual life of the lowliest is to be cherished as of infinite worth. But there is nothing sentimental in Christ's attitude, and no idealizing of childhood. The work of the little ones of the world springs from the Father's love for them and for their salvation; and it was to save them from perishing that the Son of Man had come. This emphasis on the urgency of His redeeming mission from the Father at a moment when a little child stood before Him seems paradoxical to an age which identifies childhood with innocence. But to Jesus the child was a parable of man's need of that grace and help which it was His Father's will to supply through Him. The whole scene is an illustration of the words in St. John: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."†

A similar lesson of the Father's love for man in the sin and evil which surround his life is given in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The import of the parable is the same as that of the parables of the Lost Sheep and of the Piece of Silver, which immediately precede it; and the context in which St. Luke places them is vital to their understanding.

"Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him.

"And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them."‡

The parable of the Prodigal Son is concerned with the contrast between those two types of people—those who are socially and morally outcast on the one hand, and the leaders of respectability on the other: and the second section of it (vv. 25-32) is no less important than the first (vv. 11-24). And this contrast is depicted as one which derives its sharpness from the constant and undeviating love of the Father for each alike—a love which evokes grateful and penitent response in the one group and jealousy in the other. That is the point; and there is no justification for the attempt often made to use the parable to settle controversial issues in regard to the method of the Atonement.

* St. Matt. xviii. 1-14.

† St. John iii. 16.

‡ St. Luke xv. 1, 2.

So far as any doctrine of the Atonement is concerned, indeed, the parable is less instructive than the passage in which our Lord compares the Father's love to that of the sheep-farmer who goes seeking for his lost sheep;* the root of the matter is rather that the Father "goes to fetch" than that He "goes to meet," and thus the Incarnation and the Cross are involved. But while the parable of the Prodigal Son did not, and was not intended to, provide the outline for a doctrine of the Atonement, it did emphasize one cardinal feature in any such doctrine, namely that the foundation of the Atonement is the forgiving love of God the Father. That revelation did not go the whole way: but it went beyond anything that the divine Fatherhood had meant to the Jews. It showed His love as reaching down with pardoning power into the worst miseries of man's condition.

This initiative of the Father's love for the redemption of the world is one of the themes which pervade the discourse that follows in the Johannine narrative the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The Father has sealed and sent the Son of Man for this task, and gives Him as the true bread from heaven which gives life to the world. The living Father sends Him to be the Source of life to all who believe. But it is at an infinite cost. The bread will be His flesh and blood, offered in sacrifice and imparted in sacrament. And that, too, is the Father's will. He spares not His own Son. The crudeness of Christ's language about His sacrifice must not be fined away: its realism answers to the reality of the evil in which His mission is to be achieved. And it is an essential part of the revelation of the Father. Though Christ speaks of the Father as "in heaven," that does not mean that He is unconcerned with man's misery. He transcends it, not by any metaphysical aloofness, but by the practical way of sending His only begotten Son into the midst of it and making Him perfect through suffering. And that is the only solution which Christianity offers to the problem of evil. Christ's death is the crowning revelation of the Father's love, because it is also the climax of human sin.

The story of the Passion itself contains the most signal expressions of this truth.

It was when He made the formal oblation of His death in the institution of the rite which was to commemorate it that Jesus spoke of His Father's kingdom.

It was when the burden of the world's misery was most heavy and hope most dim that He uttered the prayers:

"O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. . . .

* St. Luke xv. 3-7; St. Matt. xviii. 10-14. Cf. St. Matt xii. 11, 12; xv. 24.

"O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done."

It was when the pangs of death were already upon Him on the cross that He cried:

"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do. . . ."

"Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

So out of the depth of human misery He declares that God is His Father still.

There is still a final stage of the revelation to come: the Father's name is not only Redeeming, but Triumphant Love. This crowning truth was disclosed less in word than in deed—in the act by which Jesus was raised from the dead. But St. John has recorded for us a great saying, too, which forms a magnificent climax to our Lord's whole teaching about the Father. "Go to my brethren," He says to Mary Magdalene, "and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God."* The words were spoken to one who had been signally redeemed; and they embody the same distinction between our Lord's sonship and that of His disciples which we have noted already; but they carry with them the promise that for His Church throughout the ages as well as for Himself the Father's love was to be experienced in victory and power. It was in the light of such a faith that His disciples were to go into all the world baptizing men "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

E. G. SELWYN.

THE MEANING OF THE EPICLESIS

THE problem of the eucharistic Canon has been raised again by Fr. Mackenzie and Dr. Lowther Clarke in the February number of *THEOLOGY*. In discussing the Canon, both writers are compelled to discuss the Epiclesis. Beyond all doubt, the need for a revised Canon is extraordinarily urgent; that Canon must certainly contain an Epiclesis; and yet the Epiclesis in the 1928 Canon has undeniably been the great rock of offence. It seems scarcely rash to say that if it had not been for the Epiclesis the 1928 Canon would by this time have been in general use in the Church. It is not the aim of this article to propose some immediate solution of the problem of the Canon, but rather to urge that no ultimate solution is possible till the underlying difficulty has been further investigated. This difficulty is,

* St. John. xx. 17.

What is the real nature of the Epiclesis? Is it, as is commonly assumed, simply a prayer that the consecration may be effected? Or has it a wider meaning? This question can only be answered by a consideration of the rationale of the eucharistic action, and a comparative study of the classical liturgical texts.

I

The objection commonly made to the 1928 Canon is that it changes the place of the Consecration, and would compel those whom the 1662 form has accustomed to treat the Dominical Words as consecratory to alter their devotional habits. To this it is often replied that we ought not to try to fix a precise "moment of consecration," and that Eastern theologians, though when they are pressed they will say that they regard the Epiclesis as consecratory, really do not wish to define the moment of consecration at all. But this reply does not meet the difficulty; for even if one refrains from fixing a moment of consecration, it still remains necessary that the rationale of the eucharistic prayer should be clear and explicit. And it is just at this point that our objector is uneasy, even if he is not always able to formulate his objection. He feels that it is somehow wrong that the act of oblation, the pleading of Christ's sacrifice, should *precede* the Epiclesis-consecration; that we should *first* "celebrate and set forth the memorial which he hath willed us to make," and *then* pray that the Holy Spirit may "bless and sanctify these thy creatures of bread and wine." The difficulty applies equally to the Scottish and American rites, and also to the classical Byzantine liturgies on which they are modelled. Is it a true interpretation of the rationale to these rites to say that "we offer bread and wine and that God returns them to us as the Body and Blood of Christ"? Would this be an adequate expression of the eucharistic sacrifice?

Let us state the theological difficulty first, not shrinking from crudity of expression if only the point can be made clear. By "consecration" we mean the transformation or transvaluation of the earthly elements to become the vehicles of the heavenly reality, the sacrificed manhood of Christ; we mean the lifting-up of the earthly elements into the heavenly sphere, so that they are, in St. Irenæus' words, "no longer common bread but Eucharist." Now this "consecration" is not necessary *only* in order that the communicants may receive the Divine Gift. The memorial of our Lord's death and resurrection is not merely a human commemoration—a sort of acted parable, belonging to the same order as the representation of these things in a Passion play—followed by a prayer that the Divine Presence

may be vouchsafed for the sake of the communion-act. We want to say that the whole action, the memorial of the Lord's sacrifice as well as the communion, takes place "in the heavens." We often express this by speaking of Christ as the High Priest, the true Celebrant of every Eucharist, who in the repetition of the sacrificial rite which He instituted at the Last Supper renews His own institution, pleading His own sacrifice, and then in the communion unites His people with Himself. In other words, the "consecration" is necessary for both parts of the action, the pleading of the sacrifice and the communion.

It may be allowed that the widespread dislike of the 1928 Canon springs from various motives, which are not all, perhaps, equally praiseworthy. But behind all the devotional and ceremonial conservatism there is a deep dissatisfaction with the proposed form, due to a sense that somehow it fails to provide an adequate rationale of the eucharistic sacrifice. The difficulty lies in the place of the Epiclesis (regarded as consecratory) *after* the Memorial of Redemption.

To the classical Greek liturgies we must return later on. We must first pursue our study of the theology of the eucharistic action, continuing from the point which we have reached: the double aspect exhibited in the pleading of the sacrifice and the communion.

This doubleness belongs to the Eucharist because it first belongs to the Atonement. In the Divine redemptive work there is *first* the vicarious work of Christ for us, which consists in the manifestation in flesh and blood, under human conditions, of the Divine Goodness—in the accomplishment of the work that the Father gave Him to do, up to the moment when He could say "It is finished," and beyond that to the risen and ascended glory of the manhood of the Saviour. This is the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, worked out on earth in His whole self-offering in life and death—"Lo, I come to do thy will, O God"—and abiding for ever in His permanent presence in heaven (Heb. ix. 24) as Priest and Victim. *Second*, there is the actualization in the many sons of the salvation which came to this world in the One—the fulfilment of Christ in His Church, which is His Body, the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled (Eph. i. 23; Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 42 ff.)—the continuing work of the Holy Spirit, transforming the faithful into the image of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18). The first is God's work *for* us, the second His work *in* us.

Broadly speaking, the first is the work of the Son, the second the work of the Spirit. But the operation of the Persons of the Trinity must never be separated, though it must be distinguished.

When the Holy Spirit comes at Pentecost, it is not that He may take the place of a now absent Christ; rather, the coming of the Spirit involves the continual presence of Christ with the Church as her living Head. And similarly, the Holy Spirit is represented in the Gospels, not as absent during the period of the Ministry, but as throughout present; coming in the miraculous conception as the agent of the Incarnation, ordaining Jesus at His baptism for the active work of the Ministry, operating in Him the mighty works. At the same time, Pentecost is the opening of a new chapter, a fresh stage in the Divine Economy.

Therefore the Eucharist, as being the liturgical representation of God's redeeming work, must likewise exhibit both aspects. We may regard it *from the side of the Son*: Christ the High Priest, the Head of the Church, is the true Celebrant of every Eucharist; He offers anew His own sacrifice, renews in every Eucharist His own institution, and makes the memorial of His own death, resurrection and ascension; then when in the communion He bestows His own Body and Blood, He is carrying on His once finished work and reaping its fruits, by uniting His people with His own sacrifice, that they also may become a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice, sharing in His suffering and His triumph, crucified with Him that they may be also glorified with Him. We may say that this is the typical point of view of the Latin rite. We may equally regard it *from the side of the Holy Spirit*; He who was the agent of the Incarnation comes in awful majesty to consecrate the earthly elements to be the Living Bread and the Cup of Salvation; and He is likewise the agent of the Divine operation, through these sacramental means, in the hearts of the faithful, uniting them with Christ, overcoming in them the egocentric mind and outlook, bringing forth in them the fruits of the Spirit, and making their lives an offering to God. This is the typical point of view of the Eastern liturgies.

The eucharistic Canon, being the central comprehensive act of thanksgiving and prayer in which the meaning of the whole is summed up, must likewise express both elements, the one sacrifice of Christ, and the continual offering-up of the Church. The liturgies set forth the work of the Son in a variety of ways, centring in the recital of the Institution, which occurs in every known liturgy, with one doubtful exception. Likewise they set forth the work of the Holy Spirit, above all in the Epiclesis of the Spirit, which likewise occurs in every known liturgy, with the exception of the Roman tradition and the rites which have followed it.

We must now test what we have said by the liturgical texts themselves. We shall expect to find that the liturgical Epiclesis

corresponds to the theology of the Holy Spirit's operation, and so has a much wider reference than merely to the consecration of the elements.

II

The meaning of the Epiclesis in the classical liturgical texts can only be elucidated by placing those texts side by side, as Lietzmann does in his invaluable* *Messe und Herrenmahl*, where he indicates the dependence of one text on another by underlining the relevant words. For our present purpose it seems best to print these texts in English, referring to the original language where necessary.

(a) The eucharistic prayer of *Hippolytus* is the parent rite of East and West alike. The generally accepted conclusion of Schwartz, Connolly, and Turner, that it actually emanates from Hippolytus himself, connects it with Rome, and dates it soon after A.D. 200. The recital of the Institution ends with:

"Ye do this (but in the original Greek probably "Do this" [Lietzmann, p. 57]) in remembrance of me. Wherefore having in remembrance his death and resurrection we offer (*offerimus*) to thee the bread and the cup, giving thanks to thee that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and perform our priestly ministry (*tibi ministrare*: the Greek is given in the Clementine liturgy as *ἱερατεύειν σοι*). And we pray (thee) to send thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of thy holy church (*oblationem sanctæ ecclesiæ*), (and) uniting it in one grant to all thy holy ones who receive, unto fulness of the Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify thee through thy Servant (*puerum*) Jesus Christ, by whom glory and honour be to thee, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, both now and for ever and ever. Amen."

This text must be interpreted by itself, not in the light of later forms. It interprets "Do this in remembrance of me" (*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*) by the words "Having in remembrance . . . we offer the bread and the cup." "Offer" is a sacrificial word, and the sacrificial meaning is further expressed in the words which we have translated "perform our priestly ministry." Here, then, it would seem that the *ἀνάμνησις* which Christ commanded is interpreted as a sacrificial act of offering, and the "offerimus" means "we repeat that sacrificial rite."

What now is the meaning of "the oblation of thy holy church"? Usually it is taken for granted (as, e.g., by Lietzmann, p. 80; Gavin in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 100) that these words mean "the oblation offered by the church"—i.e., the

* Invaluable for the manner in which the texts are printed side by side and annotated: but we are sharply at issue, in this article, with much of his interpretation of their rationale.

bread and wine. But this can hardly be called satisfactory. Would not the offertory-gifts be thought of as offered by the faithful severally, rather than by the Church, as an ecclesia? Would they not be spoken of in the plural, as "oblations," rather than in the singular? Again, the offered gifts have already been referred to as "the bread and the cup," and have already been dealt with; the sacrifice of Christ has already been presented and pleaded. Surely, then, the true meaning must be that *it is the Church herself that is offered up*; the Church herself is the oblation upon which the Holy Spirit is invoked. The words that follow speak of the communicants being united in one, filled with the Spirit, confirmed in faith, and glorifying God. So interpreted, the passage gives just that conception of "transformed sacrifice" of which the New Testament is full; that which man now offers to God is not an oblation external to himself, bulls and goats, but the whole self-oblation of redeemed human nature, with and through the self-offering of the Second Adam. Thus this phrase of Hippolytus might be illustrated from Rom. xv. 16, where St. Paul speaks of himself, in his capacity as missionary, as a λειτουργὸς whose priestly ministry is the offering-up (προσφορά) of the Gentiles to God as a sacrifice "sanctified by the Holy Ghost"; or from the "living sacrifice" and "reasonable service" of Rom. xii. 1. If so, the Epiclesis in the earliest text in which it occurs is not "consecratory" at all.

(b) The so-called *Clementine* liturgy, in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, is evidently dependent on Hippolytus (Lietzmann, p. 57); it is to be noted that every word of the Anamnesis of Hippolytus is repeated in it. The text is as follows (parallels with Hippolytus are printed in *italics*):

"Wherefore having in remembrance his passion and death and resurrection from the dead and his ascent into heaven and his future second advent, in which he cometh with glory and power to judge the living and the dead and to render to each according to his works, *we offer* (προσφέρομεν) *to thee, King and God, according to his institution this bread and this cup, giving thanks to thee through him that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and perform our priestly ministry. And we pray thee to look graciously on these gifts lying before thee, thou God who art in need of nothing, and regard them with favour to the honour of thy Christ, and send down thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that he may manifest (ἀποφάνη) this bread as the body of thy Christ and this cup as the blood of thy Christ, that they who receive thereof may be confirmed in holiness, may obtain forgiveness of sins, be delivered from the devil and his deceit, be filled with the Holy Spirit, become worthy of thy Christ, and may obtain eternal life, thou being reconciled to them, almighty Master.*"

If, as is clear, this text is dependent on Hippolytus, its Epiclesis will represent an endeavour to make explicit the meaning of

"the oblation of thy holy church." The explanation is: "The church's oblation" is first Christ's sacrifice, then the participation of the faithful in His salvation, through communion. Hence the Invocation of the Holy Spirit becomes a prayer that He will *manifest* the bread and wine to be (what they are already) the Body and Blood of Christ, and a prayer for the fruits of communion. The result is that the Epiclesis begins to look like a prayer for consecration; but the rationale seems to be really ambiguous. On the one hand, the bread and wine are described as "these gifts lying before thee," which strongly suggests that the Epiclesis is meant to be consecratory; on the other, we have had in the previous sentence the "offerimus" and the rest from Hippolytus; and the word "manifest" is a very different thing from the "bless and hallow" of Basil and the "change" of Chrysostom. In sum, the effort of the Clementine liturgy to make the older form clearer is only a partial success.

(c) It is no less evident that the corresponding passage in *Basil* is based on the Clementine form (*italics* mark parallels with Clem. [Lietzmann, pp. 51, 69]).

"*Having therefore in remembrance, O Master, his saving sufferings, his life-giving cross, his burial for three days (τρίημέρου), his resurrection from the dead, his ascent into heaven, his session at thy right hand, God and Father, and his glorious and awful second advent, offering to thee thine own things of thine own, in all and for all (Choir: we hymn thee, we bless thee, we give thanks to thee, O Lord, we pray thee, O our God)—wherefore, O Master all-holy, we sinners and thy unworthy servants who have been counted worthy to minister at thy holy altar, not for our righteousness, for we have done nothing good upon earth, but for thy mercies and thy compassions which thou hast poured out on us richly, we boldly approach thy holy altar, and laying before thee (προθέντες) the anti-types of the holy body and blood we pray thee and beseech thee, O holy of holies, that by the good pleasure of thy goodness thy all-holy Spirit may come upon us and upon these gifts lying before thee, and bless them and hallow and show this bread as the precious body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ (Amen) and this cup as the precious blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ (Amen) which was shed for the life of the world (Amen); and all us who partake of the one bread and the cup, do thou unite with one another in the communion of one Holy Spirit, and that none of us may partake of the holy body and blood of thy Christ unto judgment or unto condemnation, but that we may find grace and mercy with all the saints who from all the ages have pleased thee.*"

Perhaps the prayer for unity in this formula is one of the most beautiful things in this glorious liturgy. But we are concerned with the rationale of the Epiclesis. The ambiguity which we noted in the Clementine Epiclesis has disappeared. The "we offer" of the two earlier forms has now become "we lay before thee"; it is in fact an echo of the Offertory prayers.

The gifts laid before God are "thine own things of thine own," the bread and wine in their natural substances; and the Holy Spirit is unambiguously invoked to consecrate them to be the Body and Blood of Christ. But the operation of the Holy Spirit is also seen to extend to the fellowship of the Church's life. Indeed, the Epiclesis covers not merely the consecration of the elements but also the whole of the fruits of communion, which extend to the whole of the Church's life in Christ; for a comprehensive act of intercession follows immediately. The sense that the Epiclesis is not concerned exclusively with the act of consecration is also preserved in the words "*on us and on these gifts.*"

(d) *Chrysostom* shows parallels mainly with Basil; these parallels are therefore indicated by *italics*; but a few phrases are reminiscent of the Clementine form, and are marked (C).

"Wherefore *having in remembrance* this saving commandment and all that he hath done for us, *his cross, his burial, his resurrection after three days* (τριημέρου), *his ascension into heaven, his session at thy right hand, his second and glorious advent* again, offering to thee *thine own things of thine own, in all and for all* (we praise thee, etc., as in Bas.)—also we offer to thee this reasonable and bloodless service, and we pray and beseech and supplicate thee: Send down (C) *thy Holy (C) Spirit upon us and upon these gifts lying before thee, and make this bread the precious body of thy Christ, changing it by thy Holy Spirit (Amen), and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Christ, changing it by thy Holy Spirit, (Amen), so that it may be to all who receive it (C) unto sobriety of soul, unto forgiveness of sins (C), unto communion of thy Holy Spirit, unto fulness of the Kingdom, unto boldness towards thee, not unto judgment or unto condemnation.*"

The rationale of this form is identical with that of Basil. The gifts are offered in their natural substances, and the consecratory character of the Epiclesis is further emphasized by the addition of the participial clauses. But at the same time there is an additional emphasis on the offering-up of the Church in the phrase λογικὴν λατρείαν taken from Rom. xii. 1. The Liturgy of St. James shows the same general features, and need not be quoted.

Thus the Epiclesis has undergone a definite change of rationale, and its mature form in the Byzantine rite is markedly different from what it is in Hippolytus. Coming at the close of the long recital of God's mighty works in nature and grace, from the creation to the Second Advent—a résumé of human history, having its centre in the cross and resurrection—the Epiclesis prays that by the coming of the Holy Spirit on the elements and on the Church which receives them in communion the mystery of redemption may be made present, as it were focussed, in a here and a now.

These wonderful liturgical forms give a magnificent presentation of the Holy Spirit's work in the Eucharist. When His part in the eucharistic consecration is so emphasized, it can never be treated as if it were an offering made by man, or a work of human merit; and the fact that the Epiclesis leads on to a general intercession sets forth the whole work of Divine Grace as the fruit of communion. But what of the work of the Son? It might seem that this side also is fully represented in the eucharistic prayer, with its recital of God's dealings with His world, culminating in the historical incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension. And yet, if there was in some part of Christendom a strong sense of the personal action of the living Christ as the true Celebrant of every Eucharist, renewing there His own institution, celebrating His own sacrifice, and with Himself offering up the Church to God as His Body—might there not come to be felt a deep dissatisfaction with the Byzantine development of the Epiclesis? It could not but be felt that in the Byzantine rite the present work of Christ as High Priest did not find satisfactory expression; that the Lord's own Words of Institution had become a mere part of a narrative; that, while the work of the Holy Spirit had there been splendidly set forth, the Lord's own pleading of His sacrifice and His oblation of the Church to God through communion were given very little place.

Must not something like this be the actual reason for the abandonment of the Epiclesis in the Roman rite? An Epiclesis of the type of Hippolytus would present no difficulty. It was the Western Church which in the teaching of St. Augustine produced the noblest expression which has ever been given of the offering-up of the Church in the Christian sacrifice; he delights to play upon the two senses of "the Body of Christ," telling his people that "they are what they receive," and that as Christ is offered up in sacrifice they also are offered up with Him. So he writes that "the whole redeemed City itself—that is, the congregation and society of the saints—is offered as a universal sacrifice to God by the great High Priest, who offered even himself in suffering for us in the form of a servant, that we might be the Body of so great a Head."* And with reference to the consecratory act, St. Ambrose writes: "We have seen the great High Priest come to us; we have seen and heard him offer his own blood for us; yea, he himself is manifest among us as the offerer, since it is his holy word that hallows the sacrifice that is offered."†

The key-note of the Roman Canon is the idea of offering; but not, as is commonly thought, the pleading of Christ's sacrifice

* *De Civitate Dei*, x. 6.

† *In psalmum xxxviii. enar.* 25.

only, but also the oblation of His Mystical Body. The *Hanc igitur oblationem* prays God, in allusion to the oblations made by the people at the Offertory—oblations which symbolize their self-offering—"graciously to accept this oblation of our service (*servitutis*; is this the *λατρεία* of Rom. xii. 1 ?) and that of thy whole family"; and in the *Quam oblationem* it is this oblation on which the Divine blessing is invoked, "that it may become unto us the Body and Blood of thy most beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord." As the Abbot of Mont-César Abbey, Louvain, writes: "One of the splendours of the mass is the absorption of our offering into that of Christ, to lose itself in it. At mass, the humble and timid tribute of our praises and our supplications is intimately united in one ritual oblation with the Blood of Christ, the Victim offered by us and for us. His adoration penetrates ours and transforms it; His prayer sustains ours and infinitely exalts it; and what does not become of the feebleness of our tears and our expiation, by contact with the virtue of the Divine Blood, speaking better things than that of Abel?"*

After the consecration follows the *Unde et memores*, which, while it shows parallels with *Mark*, retains the construction of the Anamnesis of Hippolytus (Lietzmann, p. 59): "wherefore, having in remembrance . . . we offer"; "the bread and the cup" reappears as "the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation." "On which," it proceeds, "we beseech thee to look with favourable countenance" (*cf.* Clem.), and receive it like the oblations of Abel, Abraham, Melchizedek (these names regularly occur in Offertory prayers in East and West). Then the *Supplices te rogamus*: "We humbly beseech thee, almighty God, bid these things to be carried by the hands of thy holy angel to thy heavenly altar, in the sight of thy Divine Majesty; that all we who, partaking at his altar, shall receive the most holy body and blood of thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace." The latter part of this sentence is, as Lietzmann says, the normal conclusion of an Epiclesis (p. 120); the first part most probably contained originally an explicit Invocation of the Holy Spirit, which was removed "at the very latest, by the time of the Gregorian revision . . . because consecratory efficacy was now ascribed to the Words of Institution and not to the Epiclesis" (p. 121 f.). We have seen reasons, I think, which adequately account for the change.

We must also refer briefly to the Egyptian rites; these contain a double Epiclesis. The earliest form, that of *Serapion*, carries on the last words of the *Sanctus*: "Full is the heaven,

* *Questions liturgiques et paroissiales*, April 1932, p. 66.

full is the earth also of thy resplendent glory, O Lord of powers; fill this sacrifice with thy power and thy participation. For to thee we offer this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering. To thee we offer this bread, the likeness (symbol) of the body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the symbol of the holy body, because the Lord Jesus Christ, in the same night . . .” The fact that “this living sacrifice” is a reminiscence of Rom. xii. 1 should warn us that this prayer for the coming of the Holy Spirit on the sacrifice is much more than a prayer merely for the consecration of the elements. We may note that the same word “bloodless” occurs also in the prayer of oblation from Chrysostom which we quoted above, in connection with the words “reasonable service.” The Second Epiclesis comes in the usual place; in *Serapion* it is an invocation of the Word in place of the Spirit, but in *Mark* it belongs to the usual Syrian type, chiefly resembling *James* (Lietzmann, p. 7 f.).

III

It remains to draw out some conclusions from our study of the Epiclesis, incomplete and fragmentary though it has been.

(i.) First, the general remark must be made that in the classical texts the Epiclesis is very far from being simply a prayer that consecration may be effected; the common interpretation of it in this sense is a symptom of an attitude of mind which lays far too exclusive an emphasis on the act of consecration and the Real Presence in the elements. Dr. Brilioth remarks of the doctrine of Transubstantiation that “by making the localized presence in the elements the centre of the theology of the Eucharist, it tied down future thought and controversy to a wrong statement of the problem.”* For four centuries now the controversial issue in the West has been that of the Reformation *versus* the Counter-reformation; and the Real Presence has been a central issue. The Catholic tendency has been to emphasize the consecration and the elevation, so that the mass can almost be regarded, sometimes, as becoming an elaborate and archaic form of Benediction, with the communion of the people as an optional appendage to it; and among ourselves the Prayer Book order, with its isolation of the Words of Institution, has powerfully aided this tendency. Commonly in our churches the consecration is followed by the singing of *Agnus Dei* and a communion hymn, which is usually an act of adoration addressed to our Lord; the magnificent Prayer of Oblation becomes a mere post-communion, and is very often not recited publicly at all. Consequently the devotions of the people are

* *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, p. 87; cf. p. 287.

centred on eucharistic adoration, and they get next to no adequate expression of the eucharistic sacrifice. It is thus a matter of really first-rate importance that permission should be given for at least the Prayer of Oblation to be publicly recited after the consecration, though the addition of the Anamnesis is scarcely less necessary; but no really adequate revision of the Anglican Canon is possible without the Epiclesis.

(ii.) But this cannot come to pass till the meaning of the Epiclesis has been more fully studied. The Epiclesis of 1549 stands alone among liturgical forms in being a prayer simply and solely for the consecration of the elements, with no mention at all of the rest of the eucharistic action. The Scottish rites since 1764, the American, and the English rite of 1928 give an Epiclesis invoking the coming of the Holy Spirit "upon us and upon these thy gifts," and therefore more satisfactory as an Epiclesis than that of 1549; but these rites are open to the objection that in attaching the consecration to the Epiclesis, they rob the Dominical Words of the great emphasis which Western tradition laid upon them in order that it might express its deep sense that Christ is the High Priest and Consecrator in every Eucharist, pleading His own sacrifice and offering up the Church with Himself.

(iii.) We need, therefore, some form of Epiclesis which shall preserve the consecratory character of the Dominical Words. Dr. Lowther Clarke makes the valuable suggestion that "the simpler we make the Epiclesis, the nearer we shall be to the Liturgy of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, which represents the parent rite of East and West alike"; in other words, Hippolytus is our best model. At the same time, everywhere except in Hippolytus and perhaps in the Clementine rite, the Epiclesis has a consecratory force. The solution would then seem to be a *divided Epiclesis*; a partial precedent might be found in the Egyptian liturgies.

Perhaps, then, the future Anglican revision might re-word the middle section of the present Prayer of Consecration somewhat as follows:

"Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy creatures of bread and wine according to our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, who in the same night that he was betrayed . . ."

Such a form would swing round the emphasis of the sentence on to Christ as the Consecrator; and it would leave the effect of the Consecration to be defined by His own words.

The Words of Institution would be followed by the Anamnesis, worded as in 1928 (a better form than 1549), and the second part of the Epiclesis:

"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, according to his holy institution do celebrate and set forth before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which he hath willed us to make, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us.

And we beseech thee to pour thy Holy and life-giving Spirit on us and on thy whole church, that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and be made one body with thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, that he may dwell in us and we in him; that so our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving may be acceptable unto thee, and that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto thee. And although we be unworthy . . ."

Such a form might be claimed to be a fair rendering of the idea underlying the form of Hippolytus, and also to do at least some measure of justice to the double aspect of the operation of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic action; setting forth Christ as pleading His own sacrifice and uniting the Church with it, and invoking the Holy Spirit to sanctify both the bread and wine and the communicants.

Needless to say, the forms here sketched out are intended as no more than illustrations of the principles which we have been studying, as they may come to be expressed in the revised English Canon of the future. Only the Church can solve for us the problem of the Canon. When Church authority tackles again this very urgent problem, the prospects of a successful issue depend mainly on the interpretation that is given of the Epiclesis. It may confidently be said that no successful solution is possible, so long as it is assumed that the purpose of the Epiclesis is consecratory and nothing more.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE DRAMATIC ELEMENT IN RELIGION

RELIGION which is, or claims to be, inclusive of every aspect of human life, can evidently be considered under innumerable aspects. This essay attempts to deal with not, perhaps, a very important aspect, but one which in the writer's opinion should not be entirely omitted from any picture that may be painted of the nature of religion as a whole.

For the present purpose I suggest that "religion" be defined as "a mode of reference from a finite to an infinite being"; and "drama" as "the artistic presentation of finite beings in their relation to other finite beings as well as in their relation to the infinite." And by "being" I mean in each case the whole man or woman, seen in the round, compact of all those qualities which we are accustomed to associate with humanity, physical as well as spiritual.

As a definition of drama the above is, I think, fairly adequate: but the definition of religion may, by its very vagueness, seem to leave out too much. Certainly it involves nothing of a personal relationship between creature and creator—not even a life of faith in the ordinary meaning of the phrase. But are these necessary concomitants of religion? Is it not possible to be intellectually convinced of the truth of a religious system, yet to lack the grace which may be needed for any conscious contact between the soul and God? One can imagine that a man might accept a theological system in much the same way as he would accept a philosophical system, as an explanation of life; the only difference being that in lieu of subscribing to the truth of a set of purely intellectual symbols, he would sit back as the satisfied spectator of a drama which he regarded as true, although he himself took no active part in it. Such a believer—or spectator, if you prefer—would be released from the necessity of substantiating his theological position on a basis of fact. But one must remember that even an active and practising believer is not normally worried overmuch by questions of historic evidence, though historical proof may rightly be invoked as a buttress to faith. Essentially, such proofs are far from being at the core of religious feeling. Just as in the theatre, for the fullest satisfaction of our dramatic taste, it makes no odds whether the play we are enjoying is an historical drama or a work of pure fantasy—whether it is *Julius Cæsar* or *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. For the integrity of a work of art is not a question of fact or falsehood in the legal sense. The distinction is really wholly irrelevant, so much so that whereas there is probably no one who would be ready to die in defence of the historic portrait drawn by Shakespeare in *King John*, it is by no means impossible that there may be several people now living who would be strongly tempted to suffer martyrdom rather than deny their faith in the imaginative reality of *Hamlet*. It is, I submit, on this imaginative plane that religion and drama meet, and may be usefully compared.

Now, when faced by manifestations of the hungers, needs, and creative acts of the human imagination, we are in the presence of something mysterious—something which science,

which hates mystery, is always trying to explain away. The anthropologists tell us that religion itself began as a form of applied science, though a science which was admittedly based on false premises. The art of drama has likewise been faced by the same type of corrosive explanation. If it has survived the analysis of scientific psychology it can only be that it, like religion, holds a content of human experience that mankind simply refuses to limit by theories of primitive magic and the like. By the same token, many people are beginning to feel that religion cannot be permanently tied down to such roots as are delved out for it by the author of the *Golden Bough*. At any rate, religion, in the modern sense, has become a thing so different from all that, that we feel it cannot fairly be compared with it. The human race is no more likely to retain belief in a priest who affirms that the farmer who can jump the highest will reap the best harvest, than in the surgeon who prescribes a gallon of water from the river Jordan as an infallible cure for appendicitis. If religion survives today among more or less civilized peoples, one must believe that its power is drawn from some deeper source than witchcraft or white magic.

Religion—to return to our original definition—is a system of reference from a finite to an infinite being, and it is a system that is articulated in two ways: (1) By way of the abstract symbols of theology; (2) by way of the concrete symbols of drama. It is by the second mode that the religious impulse is manifested most clearly to the vast majority of mankind; and under this heading should be included not only the actual representation of religious truth by means of ritual ceremonies or stage performances, but its representation through dramatic legend, pictorial art, even architecture—in short, by all those media of expression which, under the guise of art, can include that peculiar amalgam of feeling and formal definition which only art can supply. We are here concerned, however, more particularly with the dramatic element in religion. A word, then, about the dramatic impulse as such, preparatory to a brief indication of its peculiar relevance to the religious impulse from which, indeed, drama itself has been in large measure derived.

As most of us will acknowledge, ordinary life if left to itself appears to be nothing much more than a mess of incomplete and fleeting experiences. In its simplest form, drama aims at an intensification and formalization of these otherwise inchoate experiences, through the help of the imagination. As one sees it coming to birth in quite young children, play-acting is the spontaneous and normal protest of every naive and unspoilt mind against the insufficiency of things-as-they-are. So far as we know, the brute creation accepts the conditions of its

existence with an unwearying and unquestioning loyalty. In other words, the animals are purely realistic in their attitude to life. Hunger is hunger, lust lust, a spade a spade. The human being, however, even as an infant, quickly discovers that the potential interest of the world far outruns its merely phenomenal interest. So, from the first dawn of intelligence, the world as it is is found to be simply not good enough. A world of imagination or fantasy is created alongside of the ordinary world; and this creation is so instinctive that the boundary line between the two worlds is hardly noticed. Often what we call the real world passes almost unapprehended by the child. He lives, as we say, in fairyland. Little by little most children shed these veils or clouds of glory. But some children cling to them, and consciously transform them till they assume the coherent and logical lineaments of art. Now if art were the same as artifice, it might be argued that its significance was at best puerile. Drama itself would be founded on falsehood. But, as everyone admits, great art, great drama, relies for its creation not on falsehood, but on truth. Not truth, however, in the scientific sense of the word. For if the scientist's effort is to stamp the truth of things with the seal of his own intelligence, the aim of the artist is to stamp the truth of things under the seal of beauty. So, while the value of science to mankind is found in its applications to practical and utilitarian objects (pure science affording a kind of esoteric bliss which can only be known by the initiate), art, even in its pure form, is a well of inspiration to all and sundry. And even if this be not wholly true of all the arts, it is certainly true of drama which, like John Wesley, has all the world for its parish.

Drama, then, we may take as the typical means towards that intensification of life which we have seen to be a primal desire of the human being for whom the world as it is is not quite good enough. And drama, though much of its practice and technique is based on an analysis of human action and human motive as intellectual as you could wish, is not really scientific in its fundamental approach to these things, since it relies for its interpretations upon all kinds of implications and relevances which can only be described as *spiritual*. It is for this reason that the scientist might, in strict logic, be expected to find drama as distasteful as religion, since both equally seek to engage men's minds within a web of ideas and emotions from which the purely scientific intelligence would recoil in disgust. For the scientist seeks to get round the world-not-good-enough-in-itself difficulty by attempting to conform the phenomenal aspects of the world to an intellectual pattern, and thus in some degree to master it. And this can only be accomplished by

eliminating all that further part of experience which, by its very nature, refuses to be confined within an intellectual scheme. Yet it is in that very hinterland that the dramatist finds himself most at home. For the formalizations of drama are not those of the intellect but of human perception in its widest sense—a very different thing. If drama, then, is to make terms with science it can only be by seizing the scientist and turning him into the subject-matter of a play—as Shakespeare seized the philosopher and turned him into Hamlet. For without a soul to play with the dramatist is as helpless as the priest. And in this, clearly, drama is like religion, and has the same quarrel with science. For it is true, is it not, to say that the dilemma of the conflict between religion and science was fixed for all time in Christ's epigram about the man who lost his own soul to gain the world? And assuredly a man without a soul can never respond to the theatre.

Drama, then, like religion itself, predicates the existence of the soul. There is this fundamental common ground between them, and at this point we may feel justified in considering the significance of the one to the other.

In the first place, how far does religion rely on symbolic dramatization for its formulation in thought? The mystic, I suppose, scarcely deals in thought in the sense we usually think of thought. But to limit religion to such a realm of abstraction would be to commit an outrage both on fact and on history. Even Buddhism—the most abstract of religious systems—finds place for symbolizations and dramatizations as elaborate as those of Catholicism. Not to entangle ourselves in these intricacies, let us take a comparatively simple catalogue of dogmas like those contained in the Apostles' Creed. Whatever its historical truth, it will be observed that the Creed is a perfect dramatic *scenario*—a *scenario* upon which, as we know, innumerable religious plays were based in England and on the Continent during two centuries of medievalism. Nay, more. The religion of the Creed has not only provided the subject-matter for plays. It provides not only a stage drama that may be witnessed by persons in the auditorium, but, and even more essentially, a drama in which the audience itself is expected to participate—a drama which is adjustable to suit the character and circumstances of each individual actor—a drama, moreover, in which each actor may choose for himself whether he will play the villain or the hero—and a drama, finally, the moment of whose final curtain is never known till it irrevocably drops.

Have we not here a clue to the eternal fascination of religion for the human mind? A brave new world, to take the place of the admittedly insupportable world as it is. For the reality

of religion is at least as intense as the reality of a great work of drama. If only a fantasy, it is a fantasy whose logic is supreme. Thus viewed, it is no longer surprising that religion has provided one of the main springs of human feeling and of human action. For religion offers an intensification of life so potent that many a soul has fled from it, realizing that here is a white flame that threatens to devour the normal life and burn it away. And this burning is what actually happens, time and again, when a man or woman assumes the religious life in grim earnest, so that it becomes for him or for her the whole of existence, with no margin left that can be brought in to adjust the balance between the world of grace and the world-not-good-enough of ordinary life. Thus martyrs are bred. At certain periods of history quite a number of religious people must have passed their whole lives unrecognized by those about them for the potential martyrs that they were. They have not been called upon to play out their part to the bitter end. But at other times martyrdom has actually occurred, for loyalty to the drama of religion has been incompatible with loyalty to that life-not-good-enough-in-itself which was the world-as-it-was. The same martyrdom, it should be noted, would occur to any ordinary stage player who insisted on maintaining his stage character all day long as well as by night at the theatre, and in defiance of the dictates of worldly decency or normal propriety. Even as this essay was being written, we heard of the death of Anny Ahlers, an actress so in love with her art that she found it impossible to shed her stage personality even in her sleep, and so perhaps, in a fit of somnambulism, met her death. In a world-not-good-enough-in-itself was that perhaps a happy death for an actor? Just as in the greater drama of religion, it is the martyr, certainly, who deserves and wins the brightest crown.

Yet we shall all agree that there is a difference between the martyrdom of the stage player who persists in playing his part in season and out of season at the expense of the world-not-good-enough-in-itself, and the martyrdom of the saint who dies less for his own than for the world's sake. If Mr. John Gielgud strutted about London all day long in the robes of Richard of Bordeaux, and conducted himself accordingly, he would soon find himself under restraint. The crowds that came to applaud him overnight would mock him in the morning, and Richard, withal, as an imaginative creation, would be spoiled rather than vindicated by such an inappropriate persistence. What had been true enough in the ideal world of the stage would be found to be false when measured by the standard of the world-not-good-enough-in-itself. Thus it would appear that martyrdom, to be fruitful, must be suffered in response to some truth or some

need which is already latent in the world. Ultimately it is the world that is the judge. Rightly has the blood of the martyrs been called the seed of the Church. Yet not every seed of martyr's blood is fertile; for seed, though it die in the sowing, must, if it is to blossom, be in some degree congruous with the soil wherein it is sown. In other words, a "successful" martyrdom must be in line with the process of world development of which it is the harbinger. But that can never be known before the great experiment is made.

"Some seeds the birds devour;
And some the season mars,
But here and there will flower
The solitary stars."

The useless martyrdom that touches no nerve in the conscience of the world is, from the practical point of view, nothing but waste. It may even do the world a positive disservice, since its failure may only increase that cynicism which is the world's protection from the pain it sees but dare not of itself assuage. So the value, from the world's point of view, of any particular martyrdom will be tested by its ultimate effect on human life. And if this seems to offer a too pragmatic sanction, one can only refer to Christ's own precept,

"By their fruits ye shall know them."

During the period, then, when any particular religion is in line with the coming best development of the world, martyrdoms may be expected, and it behoves every member of that religion to play his part to the bitter end. To break the moral code of his religion, or to be faithless to it in act or thought, would be to do in fact what a bad actor on the stage does when he forgets his lines and thus lets down the whole company. Such an actor is guilty of artistic sin. He will rightly be dismissed from the company—just as the erring actor in the greater drama of faith forfeits his place from the company of the blessed. He also is a traitor to the cause of truth.

Whether or no a religious cult can hope to command this kind of loyalty unto death, if it is destitute of that dramatic element which alone can electrify dogma with life, is the basic problem in this question of the value of the dramatic element in religion. I believe that the history of religions shows few if any cults which have continued to nourish martyrs unless they have kept a framework at least of drama or ceremonial. If there are today certain savage cults whose intellectual content cannot survive for a moment the withering blasts of modern education—cults which yet contrive to put up a fight against the intruding religions of the West, or against no religion at all—

it can only be because of the strong hold which the dramatic element in those cults maintains on their followers. This is a signpost to the probability that even a civilized faith like Christianity could not with impunity dispense with the dramatic element in its dogmas and in the ceremonial rites of its worship. The abstract religion of the mystics could never command the allegiance of multitudes. One is reminded that religion now, according to Mr. Julian Huxley, while exploded in the old sense, may still be tolerated by the biologically enlightened as a subjective function of the mind, a "numinous" function whereby the nervous system is calmed and renovated as by a dose of waking sleep. This may satisfy for the moment, but in my opinion, religion, if it is to survive, must maintain a strong element of objectivity. Better far worship a graven image than the reflex actions of your own mind. At least you will preserve something of that sense of reference from the self to the non-self which, according to our definition, is the main motive of religious experience.

It remains to consider very shortly what are the dangers and drawbacks which may inhere in the dramatic element in religion. In the first place, there is that charge of insincerity which is often levelled against those who consciously satisfy æsthetic or sensuous longings through their enjoyment of religious ritual. But this is a charge which can be levelled against any form of religious practice, however ascetic, that fails to induce a good life. Let us rather face the fact that some people—both saints and sinners—are born with a highly developed ritual instinct, and leave it at that. To thwart this instinct can do no good to anyone, and may end in serious psychological disturbance.

Another line of criticism is, I think, more legitimate, and that is the criticism that comes from those who, disliking religion in itself, are afraid of the dramatic element because, as they say, it gives religion such an unfair advantage. Here are certain doctrines which may be true or false. On that point the normal human mind, if left to itself, might be trusted to make its own decision. Truth at last will prevail. But bring in the element of drama, and at once the pitch is queered. A purely extraneous appeal is made that clouds the judgment, and predisposes the mind to something which the cold light of reason would counsel it to reject. Is this cricket? And the criticism goes deeper than that. What shall safeguard the too impressionable soul from being lured by the dramatic appeal into accepting a religion which may be so hopelessly out of key with the real world that a disharmony may be introduced into that soul which will tear its life to tatters—one drama incompatible with the other, as we saw a while back?

On the whole, it seems to me that the danger of such disharmony in individuals, and even in groups, must perpetually recur so long as religion and secular life change and develop at the same moment in different directions or at different rates. This, however, is not an argument against religion as such—nor yet against drama as a mode of its expression. Disharmonies must occur from time to time in a world of change. Where possible they must be resolved. But there can be no permanent solution by the simple process of pretending that one side or other does not exist. To keep in mind the thought of religion as in some sense “drama” may perhaps help us to avoid that fanaticism which too often makes for trouble whether in social life or in personal experience.

GEOFFREY WHITWORTH.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue, Mr. Geoffrey Whitworth is Secretary of the British Drama League, which incorporates the Village Drama Society. His paper is timely in view of the widespread revival of religious drama in recent years.

The Committee of "Friends of Reunion" hope to have a Prospectus and some literature ready early in October: and any reader of THEOLOGY who is interested may have this sent free of charge, on application to the Rev. Trevor Kilborn, Annandale, North End Road, London, N.W. 11.

The Rev. Geoffrey Carlisle, Rector of All Saints, Barberton, South Africa, has written a pamphlet (published by the Caxton Printing Works, Ltd., Pretoria) entitled *This World Second*. It has been elicited by a book called *This World First*, by a Mr. Curle, a mining engineer, which appears to have had considerable vogue in South Africa. Mr. Carlisle has packed an immense amount of sound theology and pithy criticism into his rejoinder, and we suspect that it will open the eyes of many as to what Christianity really teaches.

The July number of *The Faith in Wales*, a Welsh Church Quarterly, is notable for a brilliant little article by Lady Williams on "The Need for Clear Thinking."

NOTE

"DECENTLY AND IN ORDER"

IN its early days THEOLOGY published a plea for the setting up of an Anglican Congregation of Rites. That the idea is most laudable was no doubt as self-evident then as it is now; but, in view of the fact that the clergy of the Catholic Movement are not even able to agree among themselves as to a basis of uniformity for the recitation of the Divine Liturgy itself, it is hardly likely that the rulings of an official or even unofficial body which attempted to regulate their forms of ceremonial would command very wide respect. Yet the present diversities of ceremonial usage are even more numerous than those of rite, and whilst they may be in themselves less serious they are certainly no less irritating, both to the layman who goes to his usual service of High Mass when he is away on holiday and finds everything unfamiliar, and to the priest who is acquainted with the general principles of both the "Western" and the English use, but finds that in the church where he is taking duty he is constantly being distracted by numerous individuals clad in red and lace, and/or albs and apparels, whose chief occupation seems to be that of prompting him to

interpolate various weird and wonderful ceremonial evolutions which, he is informed, are the custom of the place. Yet, assuming that the majority of the clergy possess some common and a little liturgical sense, it should need not a Congregation of Rites, but only the will to be consistent and the enterprise to study a book for the Church of England to be rid of most of the great deal of ceremonial fuss and nonsense with which its public worship is beset at the moment, and for one or other of two reasonable, dignified and authentic types of ceremonial to be found wherever an "advanced" form of worship obtains.

The early "ritualists" of the Catholic Revival adopted the liturgical colours and general ceremonial principles of contemporary Roman Catholicism. Their adaptation was, as far as can be seen, inaccurate in detail, and their unfamiliarity with ceremonial practice led them into many curious excesses and eccentricities, some of which in churches with a long Catholic tradition still survive and are even copied. It was unfortunate but only natural that in turning their eyes to contemporary Roman Catholic ceremonial the Victorian "ritualists" should have appropriated the characteristic church art of the period as well. The garbled and fussy ceremonial has in many places been revised, but the red cassocks, laced cottas, candle-stocks with tin shields and superabundance of bad brass are still unhappily with us. It was partly due to the reaction from Victorian ideas of art, but more largely to research in matters concerning the mediæval English Church, that towards the end of the century there arose a school of thought which believed that on both legal and æsthetic grounds the clergy would do better to turn back to the English traditional usages which the compilers of the Prayer Book had in mind and to adapt the principles common to them, modified only by the requirements of the Book of Common Prayer. This became a practical policy by the publication in the late nineties of *The Parson's Handbook*, which made it possible for the first time for all clergy to possess a concise yet detailed and authenticated exposition of Catholic usage according to English tradition. From this time emerged the two schools of thought—or of sentiment, because in lack of thought lies the whole trouble—which persist in the Catholic movement today; and opinion, or feeling, is now about equally divided between those who incline towards an English use and those who prefer the "Western" use of contemporary Roman Catholicism. Revised editions of *The Parson's Handbook* and the various publications of the Alcuin Club have made easily accessible clear and authoritative rules by which clergy of the former school can be guided in the ordering of public worship and the adornment of churches, whilst Dale's *Baldeschi* and most of the Anglican adaptations of it have, for those of the other opinion, been rendered superfluous by the critical and accurate work of Dr. Adrian Fortescue.

Both schools of thought can present a logical and tenable case for their position. Those who would adopt the English use do so because, they would maintain, not only is the traditional English type of altar and of vestment better suited æsthetically to the English parish church and the English ceremonial more dignified, but because this use conforms more closely both to the spirit and to the letter of the Book of Common Prayer. Also they would hold that it betokens a lack of imagination to neglect such a wealth of national tradition in favour of what is frankly alien, and that in this, as in its use of the vulgar tongue, the English Church whilst asserting its Catholic character can afford to differ from the rest of

Western Christendom. On the other hand, the advocates of "Western" use maintain that the English Church has no need to revive the past, but as in the case, say, of a family of noble origin which for some generations had fallen on hard times and whose fortune has now turned, should in its restoration adopt the customs and manners of the present day. In other words, they would say that the practice of the English Church should be, subject to its own formularies, what it would have been if the adversities which followed the Reformation had never befallen it. They would further assert that their emphasis on similarities to, rather than differences from, the rest of Western Christendom has not only an evidential and sentimental value, but that in these days of cheap and popular travel it is of great importance to celebrate the English liturgy with a form of ceremonial which will serve to break down the barrier of language and enable the ordinary worshipper on his holiday to follow Mass as intelligently at Paris, Florence or Oberammergau as he can in his own parish church.

But the trouble lies in the fact that, whilst almost all clergy in the Catholic Movement are advocates, or even partisans, of one or other of those two opinions, a large proportion as far as their practice in their own churches is concerned seem to get no further than elaborating public worship with a conglomeration of unnecessary processions, unauthentic ceremonies, "vesper lights," red cassocks with albs and all the worst features, liturgical and artistic, of both types. The first business with which a Congregation of Rites would need to concern itself would be with excess, not of Romanism or of mediævalism but of individual bad taste.

Yet, as has been suggested, the remedy lies in a little thoughtfulness and a little enterprise on the part of the clergy. Those who would revise their ceremonies according to the English use have an easy task, whilst the "Western" school in adapting Latin ceremonial needs only to exercise some imagination, and to remember one of its fundamental reasons for choosing this type at all, to justify the omission of some of its less desirable details. In adopting contemporary customs and manners, even if it does have to go abroad for them, it can still remain English. The kiss is a prominent and apparently necessary public custom among the Gallic and Latin peoples, and because of its place in their social manners it has found its way into the ceremonial of public worship, where manners also play some part. But this is one of the things to which Englishmen do not take kindly, in church or elsewhere, and the *solita oscula* of the biretta, the thurible, the cruets and of the officiating clergyman's hand can well be omitted in a communion where there is some freedom in these matters—as Dr. Adrian Fortescue wished in a communion where there apparently is not. What is needed among us is not slavery to detail but consistency in adopting authentic ceremonial outlines and general principles.

The present is not a time when the English Church can afford to be preoccupied with secondary things, yet since the problem of liturgical uniformity still seems to be given prominence at priests' conventions and elsewhere, perhaps it is justifiable to express the hope that at the same time some consideration might also be given to this matter, which is no less irritating than the present varieties of rite, and which could be rectified at once if the clergy would realize that the gnats still need to be dealt with even if due attention is being paid to the existence of camels.

E. G. D. FAWKES.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxiv., No. 1.

Professor E. A. Speiser continues his useful notes on the pronunciation of Hebrew, based chiefly on the transliterations in the Hexapla.

Dr. Bernard Heller gives a first instalment of a lengthy account of Louis Ginsburg's *The Legends of the Jews*. This great undertaking, which was launched by the appearance of Volume I. in 1909, and completed with Volume VI. (being notes to Volumes III. and IV.) in 1928, aims at containing a complete collection of this Haggadic material with reference to Biblical stories and personages. Stories relating to the Tannaim and Amoraim are not included. Ginsburg traces unknown and forgotten Midrashim, searching not only *Editiones Principes* but the manuscript treasures of Europe and America.

Professor Solomon Zeitlin writes on the origin of the Kethubah, a written contract by which the bridegroom promises to support his wife and to settle on her a certain sum of money (cf. Gen. xxxiv. 12): "Ask of me never so much *mohar*." Zeitlin quotes, without giving the number and page, an interesting marriage document in the Elephantine Papyri (Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, No. 15, lines 4 and 5, p. 44 and note, p. 47): "She's my wife and I her husband from this day forever. I have given you as the *mohar* of your daughter Miphtahiah the sum of five shekels." For the Kethubah in the Marriage Service see *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, ed. Rev. S. Singer, p. 299.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

The July number opens with a careful article upon the conception of the Church during the first four centuries. It is a first instalment, and it largely turns upon the question of the Roman primacy. Father de Lacher continues to investigate the Albigensian question during its crisis. He brings out the secular as well as the ecclesiastical aspects of this heresy, and indeed he is inclined to lay more stress upon the former. Father Gougoud discusses the monastery of Eller, Father Bouyges adds considerably to our knowledge of the "*Manricius hispanus*," which Robert de Courçon laid under a ban in 1215. His article is very elaborate. Father Thibaut de Maisières has much to say about diocesan museums in the past, and he brings together a mass of out-of-the-way knowledge. This remark also applies to Father de Lacher's able contribution.

R. H. MURRAY.

REVIEWS

ADVENTURES OF IDEAS. By Alfred North Whitehead. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

It is commonly said that great history is no longer being written by historians. Dr. Whitehead would find himself in agreement with the criticism which underlies this statement, for his instincts are Hellenic rather than Hellenistic. He believes that free speculation is not only vital to knowledge, but vital to civilization. This book is a brilliant defence of this position, and is itself mainly historical. The scientific historian will no doubt find himself quarrelling with it at times (for Dr. Whitehead is not a scientific historian), but the student who does not pride himself on his claims to speak with authority on a particular phase of one particular period will find in it an astonishing appreciation of the sweep of history and a most penetrating judgment on its detail. The book begins with a survey of the historical development of certain ideas in the framework of Western civilization—the idea of freedom, for example, or the progress from force to persuasion. The second part contains a study, and from the point of view of the layman of science a most illuminating study, of the cosmologies of history and their influence on the thought of their period. The third is a restatement of Dr. Whitehead's own system—an attempt to provide the coherent background for the bewildering complexity of modern knowledge. This is a difficult section, and one in which the reader who is not familiar with the writings of the school to which Dr. Whitehead belongs may often lose his way. The fourth is a discussion of the intellectual and spiritual qualities of civilization—truth, beauty, adventure, and peace. It will be seen that the title of the book is an allusion partly to the adventures of ideas in their progress through history, partly to the idea of adventure as one of the springs and sources of vital intellectual achievement.

The cleavage between science and philosophy may have been inevitable, but it was a circumstance by which both Urania and the unnamed muse of pure philosophy (was she perhaps Polyhymnia?) suffered loss. Our greatest difficulty nowadays is to keep our problems in perspective. The remarkable quality of this book is that it gives us such a perspective glimpse of them. We do feel at last that we can see for a moment the wood, trees and all. The scientific thought of any period is imperfectly understood except by a small circle of sages. But

it nevertheless conditions the whole intellectual outlook of that period. Darwinism modified the attitude towards the Bible of millions of people who did not begin to understand Darwinism. Addison may not have mastered the Newtonian cosmology, but his great hymn is a magnificent example of the popular interpretation—by no means wildly inaccurate—of that cosmology. It is largely because history is here being written by a scientist who understands this changing background that the book is so illuminating for the ordinary man who has hitherto neglected it. Plato was not merely a literary stylist. He was a scientist who put over his doorway a notice (which has certainly not succeeded in deterring a number of those, like the present writer, whom it ought to have deterred) that no one was to enter who had not a knowledge of geometry. Dr. Whitehead (who is himself, so the layman understands, responsible for a handful of new geometric systems) has got this requisite knowledge; and though we may consider that he lays an undue amount of stress on a remark in the *Sophist*, "I hold that the true definition of being is simply power"—which in its context gives no warrant for supposing that it was a considered statement of the Platonic view of reality even for the time being—we cannot but feel that its treatment both of this remark and of Platonism in general is extraordinarily illuminating. It is perhaps true that Plato would never have maintained in isolation that "the essence of being is to be implicated in causal action on other beings"; but one has no sooner made the statement than one remembers the phrase in the tenth book of the *Republic*—actually as early as that—"and the excellence or beauty or truth of every structure, animate or inanimate, and of every action of man, is relative to the use for which Nature or the artist has intended them." The one position is not so far from the other. It takes a scientist, too, to explain the Alexandrian age or the cosmology of the ancient atomists; and in both of these instances Dr. Whitehead's explanation is, in fact, brilliant. We all know that Epicurus in some way anticipated the atomic theory. What most of us do not know, or have not noticed, is the relation between Lucretius' hypothesis of the "swerving atom" and the problem "what is a law of nature?" Did he conceive the atoms as swerving because they "proclaimed some great original," that is to say, because there was a law imposed upon them from without, by chance, or by anything else, to do so; or can we get no further than saying that they do swerve, and is the law that they swerve merely a description of the facts? And when Newton demonstrated, in the words of one of his friends, "all the laws of the celestial motions," in what sense were they laws? To suggest these questions is to make

the problems of the ancient scientist-philosopher real, otherwise they are for most of us meaningless relics—probably owing to a belief, which it takes a modern scientist to explode, that by now they have long ago been solved. Quite apart from its scientific penetration, moreover, the book constantly manifests the ripe judgment of its author. A characteristic instance is the paragraph in which the influences of the original circumstances and environment on Christian ethics are discussed.

Dr. Whitehead is interesting about the present and the future, as well as about the past. His analysis, to take one example, of freedom in modern civilization is of the greatest value. Yet through the book one feels that the conviction of the deep significance of the past for the present is of importance, almost of primary importance, in the writer's mind. The rise of Christianity for him is a process in which the Incarnation is an incident rather than a first cause; so that there would be an intellectual, if not an æsthetic, justification for replacing the Apocalypse by the Platonic dialogues. As in his theory of perception he refuses to admit that we can ever discern a clean-cut sense perception wholly concerned with present fact, but maintains that "the present occasion, while claiming self-identity," is "showing the very nature of the bygone occasion in all its living activities," and "is engaged in modifying it, in adjusting it to other influences, in completing it with other values, in deflecting it to other purposes"; so in history, in civilization, in life, or whatever you like, the present is constituted by the "influx of the other" into itself. The past is still vital. The past never dies; or, if you prefer it, then it is always rising again, like Banquo, "with twenty trenched gashes in his crown," to hunt us down with curses or blessings, or at least to influence us profoundly. It is a matter of powerful experience with almost everyone that certain moments, which belong to a past, years old, remain in consciousness, or more likely just over its edge, keeping an extraordinary vividness and conditioning thought. Adventuring ideas exercise these influences not merely in individual lives but in history.

WALTER OAKESHOTT.

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE: A DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY.

By George H. Joyce, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 21s.

This handsome and well-produced book of six hundred and thirty pages is the first volume of a projected *Heythrop Theological Series*, which "in its own field" (in the publishers' words) "will stand as the equivalent of the renowned *Stonyhurst*

Philosophical Series." As to the excellence of the present volume there can be no two opinions. It is true that with Esmein and Freisen at his disposal no modern scholar has far to look for his authorities; and Father Joyce does not lay claim to any new discoveries in the field of evidence, nor to original interpretations of fact. But the presentation of the material is admirably done; the index is detailed, accurate, and intelligent; and the reader can find his way about with the greatest ease. The book is certainly one which no serious student of the canon law and theology of marriage can afford to neglect. And it should be added that the tone and temper throughout are equally admirable; witness in particular Father Joyce's attitude to the Church of England. It is a pleasure to record that Father Joyce puts first among the authorities to whom he "acknowledges a special indebtedness" an Anglican work—Mr. O. D. Watkins's *Holy Matrimony*. This is all the more gratifying in that Mr. Watkins's treatment of the subject was not always above criticism; Father Joyce has detected these weak spots, but treats them in a most courteous and kindly fashion. We may refer particularly to the discussion on pages 501-504. Elsewhere he repeatedly cites Watkins with approval. With Canon Lacey he is only a little less gentle, and he has missed the full ingenuity of that writer's argument about "successive polygamy" which he discusses on page 573—though it is not to be inferred from this that the argument is in itself defensible. It was not to be expected that the hesitations of successive Lambeth conferences would escape his notice: but even here there is no bitterness in Father Joyce's comments—he is content to notice facts, to pass on.

On the other hand, the book recognizes with disarming frankness that difficulties are involved in the full Roman Catholic canon law of marriage, and that on occasion practice, to say the least, scarcely appears to square with principle. But of the problems which Father Joyce's pages present to the reader, one at least is of his own making. This is his failure to treat the question of nullity under a single rubric. There is probably no matter on which clear and scientific teaching is more urgently needed than that of impediments, and the problems of principle raised in this connection are very numerous. The classification of impediments, the right course of action when an impediment is discovered, the processes of securing a dispensation, the various methods of convalidation, and so forth, form a clearly recognizable chapter in the system of Christian marriage; and to treat them *en passant* as side issues arising out of other and more important matters—still more, to neglect some of them altogether—is to confuse counsel. All the more

so is this the case, since both the mediæval and even the modern Latin Churches lie under a certain suspicion of having employed, and even of still employing, the decree of nullity to the same effect as that secured by the divorces of most secular codes, or of the Eastern Church. The matter, it is well known, is still involved in a good deal of confusion and controversy; and it is difficult to understand why Father Joyce should allow it so very little prominence in his pages, or why his casual allusion to the controversy (pp. 385, 386) should be so perfunctory.

The real problem for any modern Roman Catholic writer on marriage, however, arises out of the fundamental opposition between the theory that marriage derives its indissolubility from the natural law, and the theory that Christian marriage alone is indissoluble, and that by virtue of its sacramental character. The question has a practical aspect in reference to marriages contracted in heathendom, in which one party thereafter becomes a Christian and wishes to be rid of the original contract. It is well known that the Papacy during the last two hundred years, reversing precedent practice, has not shown itself deaf to appeals of this character; and it seems no longer possible (as, with a certain exercise of ingenuity, it still was for Benedict XIV.) to vindicate these instances of benevolent leniency by appeal to the well-recognized principle of the so-called "Pauline privilege." Roman apologists, therefore, have found themselves obliged to declare that only sacramental marriage—*i.e.*, marriage between baptized persons—is fully indissoluble; and this being so, indissolubility cannot depend upon the natural law. Hence Father Joyce, following modern Roman authorities, says frankly (p. 496): "The Pope can dissolve a marriage where one of the partners remains in unbelief." This raises an interesting problem, which must from time to time occur in practice. If one of two unbaptized partners presents himself for baptism, admitting that he has more than once secured a divorce and been "remarried" in his unbaptized condition, and at the same time asking that his existing marriage shall be dissolved, which of all his marriages will be considered the "existing" one—the first, or the last? If the first, then it can only be in virtue of the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage by natural law, which must be reintroduced to give the first marriage a degree of obligation higher than that of its successors; if the last, then we seem to have admitted the legitimacy of civil divorce for unbaptized persons, and if the catechumen had taken the precaution of securing such a divorce before presenting himself for baptism, he would be free to marry anyone he wished after baptism without further question. In either case, the solution is obviously paradoxical.

Another difficulty created by Papal legislation on matrimonial questions is connected with the Tridentine decrees. It is no doubt legitimate for any Church to declare a "marriage" invalid in which no precautions whatever are taken to secure publicity; and equally to brand it as "irregular" if the formalities prescribed by the Church are omitted. But to make the presence of the *parochus a sine qua non* in such a way that only marriages contracted before him are valid is to take a very extreme step indeed: and it is not mitigated by the fact that, in somewhat similar fashion, the Church of England refuses to regard as valid marriages contracted in default of certain legal formalities imposed by statute law. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Father Joyce approaches the question of the "doctrinal justification" of the *Tametsi* with considerable hesitation, and that the best he can say is that, after four hundred years of discussion, it is "still an open question" (p. 128).

We may notice another of the peculiar difficulties under which Roman Catholic writers labour. Father Joyce finds himself obliged, in discussing the New Testament passages about divorce, "to take it for granted that the Gospels, as we possess them, are the work of the writers whose names they bear, and that the testimony of such witnesses is thoroughly reliable." "The arguments for the authenticity of these writings," he adds, "are overwhelming" (p. 274). It will be seen at once that a writer who starts from such presuppositions is bound to find himself at a disadvantage in dealing with the two crucial Matthæan passages. So Father Joyce, in his discussion of Matt. v. 31, 32, is content with only the sketchiest reference to the fact that, superficially at all events, the text offers some measure of support to the view that an injured husband is free to remarry after divorce; and on xix. 9, though he rightly points out that if the all-important words imply "an absolute divorce with the power of remarriage," "our Lord's replies lose all coherence" (p. 281), yet it is clear that this is what the words *do* seem to imply, and that to get any other meaning out of them is supremely difficult. To say that "they must signify: It is not lawful for any man to put away his wife except for impurity; and if a man put away his wife [for that or any other cause] and marrieth another woman he committeth adultery" (p. 283) is wholly arbitrary. Which, after all, is the better method of approaching questions of this kind—frankly to adopt the well-proved synoptic hypothesis, or to find oneself forced into circumlocutions such as this of Father Joyce's: "It is certainly strange that our Lord should have expressed Himself in a manner liable to misrepresentation. It must be owned that this constitutes a difficulty, and that

no solution which we can offer can lay claim to certainty. But there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the evangelist has given us a compressed account of what was actually said; and that in fact our Lord set forth in separate statements the indissolubility of marriage, and the right of permanent separation in case of unfaithfulness. The fusion of the two replies into a single sentence would amply account for the obscurity"? What are we to think of "the thorough reliability" of an author who can produce obscurities as opaque as this by means of his "fusions"?

In matters of this kind, a reader who is not himself a Roman Catholic will feel that Father Joyce has been hampered by limitations peculiar to his Church; but once this is recognized the merit of the work remains unimpaired. It is cordially to be hoped that future volumes of the series will exhibit the same high qualities of excellence; and that the strain of producing so exhaustive a book will not deter Father Joyce from future contributions in the same vein.

K. E. KIRK.

NOTICES

THE LIFE OF JESUS. By Maurice Goguel, translated by Oliver Wyon. London: George Allen and Unwin. 25s.

Here we have before us the positive results of many years' critical study by a leading authority. We are delighted by many-sidedness of view, liveliness of spiritual understanding, strictness of intellectual integrity. But is the task of itself a possible one? M. Goguel poses this question in taking up his position against the *Formgeschichtliche Schule*. Bultmann has denied the possibility of any history of Jesus which attempts to set forth the logic of events or the development of our Lord's purposes: we know only a few bare facts, and for the rest must be content to expound our Lord's teaching in general (as so brilliantly done in Bultmann's *Jesus*).

Against this denial M. Goguel sets his whole book. His criticisms of extreme *Formgeschichte* are lucid and cogent, much on the same lines as those of Dr. Easton and Dr. Vincent Taylor. But it is not enough to vindicate the value of our Gospels as biographical reminiscence. Are they such evidence as enables us to pass beyond and behind them to the reconstruction of history proper? This M. Goguel can show by nothing but the success of his own attempt. He proposes to use psychological intuition and conjecture, but hopes that conjecture may reach probability, in explaining the four crises of our Lord's career which alone call for historical reconstruction—a continuous history in the old diary-like style he of course renounces.

The chief novelty is M. Goguel's use of the Fourth Gospel to illuminate

these crises—our Lord's beginning to teach in independence of the Baptist, His relinquishing the Galilean Mission, His moving to Jerusalem, His arrest and trial. M. Goguel holds the Fourth Gospel to be in general character unhistorical in the narrow sense: but finds in it older non-Synoptic sources, whose disagreement with "John's" picture guarantee their independence. Thus John iii. 22 to iv. 3 evidences a separation of Jesus from the Baptist on the issue of *καθαρισμός*, taken to mean baptism itself. This might be so: but need it? Allowing a non-Johannine source here, need it be a neutral witness to original dependence of Jesus on the Baptist? Why not equally well a pre-Johannine Christian tradition already tending in "John's" own direction, simply setting Jesus and the Baptist in rivalry, for the glory of the former? Can *καθαρισμός* be assumed to mean baptism, when in ii. 6 and always in the Gospels it refers to Jewish "purifications"?

For the second "crisis," John vi. 15 is made our clue—Jesus leaves the crowd lest they make Him king by force. From a Messiah threatened by Antipas they would accept nothing but political revolt: so our Lord gives up His mission in Galilee. But need this verse be from a source? In the Marcan narrative, Jesus dismisses the crowd and goes away to pray—a motive disallowed by St. John's theology. That he might have himself chosen to substitute the "earthly kingdom" motive is suggested by its presence in the "dogmatic" context ("meat that perisheth") and its reappearance in xviii. 36 ("My kingdom is not of this world").

Again, on the last "crisis," M. Goguel is so sure that John's whole trend is to exculpate the Romans, that the presence of a cohort at the arrest must be due to a source. Hence an intricate reconstruction coupling Pilate with the Priests in the plot for Jesus' arrest. But might not the pro-Roman motif have yielded place for a moment to another—the effectiveness of a scene in which a whole cohort falls to the earth at Jesus' word?

In all these cases, does not the force of M. Goguel's conjecture rest on its claim to be the most probable, from among a definite number of possibilities contemplated? But, in such cases, are not the possibilities really endless? Must we not be content, then, with Dr. Taylor to be ignorant in nearly all cases in which our sources fail to give us directly what we want?

Let the reader think what he may of the speculative conclusions, he will find a masterly exposition of the present critical position: many fresh and brilliant treatments of single points: sound criticism of many theories: and, in an appended chapter a summary of our Lord's thought, of such insight, balance, and convincingness as, when compared with the historical conclusions, to make M. Goguel himself an unwilling witness to Bultmann's contention.

The translator's English is beautiful. We regret to have to warn readers against false renderings at crucial points.

AUSTIN FARRER.

PERSONALITY AND HOLY COMMUNION. By D. S. Guy. Mowbrays. 5s.

Canon Guy has read a great many learned books of theology and philosophy, a list of which is given in an Appendix. In his book he tries, with a considerable measure of success, to apply the lessons he has learned to the problems of the Eucharist. By the Eucharist he means the rite, especially as it appears to Anglicans, primarily in its practical and devo-

tional aspect. He never gets far away from the intimate and personal note of a parish priest instructing an educated congregation. This is all to the good. We have many books for scholars, comparatively few addressed to the thoughtful laity. A passage on p. 44 will illustrate the style: "Most certainly and frequently the Holy Communion Service does this, both in its bass and treble regions, in its voices of warning and in its tones of triumph. Again and again it emphasizes the reality of sin, again and again it proclaims provision for cleansing. They dot the whole service like the black and white notes of a piano. As surely as the Gospel is full of sin and its forgiveness, of man's need and of the redemptive love of God, so is our service of Holy Communion." A sympathetic reader, here as in many another place, might wonder whether there was enough original matter in the book to justify its publication. But, if he is wise, he will remember that it is more important to be true than to be new, and will be grateful to Canon Guy for many true things beautifully said.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

RELIGIOUS PLAYS. Arranged and edited by E. Martin Browne, director of religious drama in the diocese of Chichester. Philip Allan.

No. 8. *Christ Crucified*. Margaret Cropper.

No. 6. *Jacob*. Arthur Hood.

No. 5. *The York Nativity Play*. (Fourteenth century.)

No. 7. *The Prodigal Son*. The Rev. Seaward Beddow.

When I took a small nephew of mine to see a beautiful Nativity play at St. Botolph's Church, Cambridge, he said to me: "Why don't they have a play like this every day in the week? There are plenty more."

Here, then, are some of the "plenty more." By far the most reverent and spiritual is *Christ Crucified*, by Margaret Cropper. Gravely and quietly acted, and receptively seen, it should stir intense feelings of devotion. It should be acted in a church, and looked on as a religious service.

Jacob is modern in treatment, but nothing in the language or action jars. The character of Jacob is well thought out and clearly presented. This play might very well be given out-of-doors.

The York Nativity play has a distinct flavour of its own, a mingled simplicity and quaintness, an acceptance of the miraculous as part of an everyday life that was closer to the supernatural, both diabolic and divine, than everyday life is now. The insistence, however, on Joseph's suspicion that the Virgin had been unchaste is not nowadays acceptable, though some audiences might forgive it in a mediæval play. Mediæval and not Oriental costume would be essential for a successful presentation.

Of *The Prodigal Son* the less said the better. Doubtless it was written with devotional intention. But does the author seriously think he is edifying us by making the family of the Prodigal bicker like characters in a Delafield play? And is not the portrait of the Prodigal's father little short of blasphemous? I sincerely apologize to the author for this criticism, but I feel too strongly to withhold it.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

ST. JEROME: THE EARLY YEARS. By Paul Monceaux. (Translated by F. J. Sheed.) Sheed and Ward. 6s.

Why do we read the Lives of the Saints? Is it for mere human interest, because saints were unusual men and women who were sure to have adventurous lives? Or do we read to discover the secret of their saintliness, and to see whether we may aspire to holiness too?

Anyone opening Paul Monceaux's book from the second motive will be very much disappointed. The author has nothing at all to tell us about St. Jerome's spiritual achievement; in fact, he leaves us in doubt whether so violent and changeable a man can really have been a saint at all. The human interest, however, is there. The pages devoted to St. Jerome's school days are particularly vivid, and his loneliness in the desert is well depicted.

The book, though, is not a success. Somebody else ought to have written about St. Jerome. Paul Monceaux would have done better with another subject.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE CHURCH SCHOOL COMES TO LIFE. By Mildred Hewitt. Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net.

Either the conditions of parish life in the United States are even more different from those obtaining in England than we supposed, or the plans for voluntary religious education advocated in this book are merely a fond hope. The "Church School" is the equivalent of the "Parish as a school of religion" of which we have heard much of late. So far so good: the ideal is one which we cordially share, and one which we believe to be capable of realization. But the plans for carrying out this ideal detailed in this book strike us as being over-elaborated to a degree that is not only quite impracticable, but essentially undesirable. One gets the impression of a staff of most improbable proportions and docility feverishly and interminably arranging and rearranging its organization, syllabus, and programme. Teachers and taught are alike subjected to frequent and minute inspection and "testing," and the results are as frequently co-ordinated and filed. This over-elaboration tends to prejudice us against a system about which there are very many attractive features. The insistence laid upon the need of relating what is taught to real situations of everyday life, upon "Christian attitudes" as the end to which all religious education should tend, and upon the co-operation of the class with the teacher, is admirable. On the whole, we do not think that the ordinary parish priest or Sunday School superintendent in England would derive much practical benefit from this book.

A. R. BROWNE WILKINSON.

ESSAYS IN ORDER. Sheed and Ward. 2s. 6d. each.

No. 8. *The Modern Dilemma*. Christopher Dawson.

No. 9. *The New Psychologies*. Rudolph Allers.

No. 10. *The Nature of Sanctity*. Ida Coudenhove.

This admirable series maintains its high level of interest in these three papers. The modern dilemma which Mr. Christopher Dawson discusses is essentially the problem of European unity. The new order must be intercultural and not merely international. But at present Europe lacks

any single spiritual purpose such as would restore the unified culture that it has lost. The problem is, can such a spiritual purpose be regained? In order to answer the question four main traditions in European culture in the past are examined—Christianity, Humanitarianism, Science, and Democracy. The section in which the prospects of these four ideals are discussed is brilliant and stimulating. The reader accustomed to mark outstanding phrases will find his pencil in use on almost every page. The conclusion reached is that the ideals represented by the last three can have no validity apart from religion. But no religion that does not combine the principles of transcendence and catholicity can avail to redeem the culture of today. Thus the Catholic Church is a condition of the New Order.

In No. 9 of this series Dr. Allers is chiefly concerned with a criticism of the two main schools of medical Psychology—psycho-analysis and individual psychology. The root objection to the former school, especially as represented by Freud, is that it gives no satisfactory explanation of the gap between organic and mental life. It gives a "psychology from below," and is bound by its own premisses to find a materialistic basis for every psychological phenomenon. It is therefore quite incompatible with Christian thought. On the other hand, the individual psychology of Adler is partly approved. Its chief lack is that of an adequate philosophical basis which leads it to conclusions that need amplification rather than denial. The concept of totality is in effect a reinstatement of the much older concept of *morphe* and of the postulate of a soul which not only is the sum of fundamental tendencies, but is that which possesses them. Individual psychology needs a Christian philosophy if it is to be more than an empirical method of education.

The Nature of Sanctity, by Ida Coudenhove, is an essay of great beauty and interest. It is in the form of a dialogue about the meaning of the life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary. Its purpose is disclosed in the Foreword: "Institutional Christianity is being widely challenged for its alleged inability to provide a consistent way of life within the modern world. This has come as a challenge to Catholics and has had the effect of calling from them an effort precisely towards a vindication of the vitality, inclusiveness, and co-ordinating power of the Faith." The nature of sanctity is found to be that integrating love of God which, far from drawing the Christian saint away from "real" life to an unreal asceticism and detachment, furnishes him with the only satisfactory motive and ground for a life of active love. There is great depth of thought and insight in this essay, which is also great literature.

A. R. BROWNE WILKINSON.

SCHLEIERMACHERS PREDIGT UND DAS HOMILETISCHE PROBLEM. By Wolfgang Trillhaas. Hinrichs, Leipzig. M. 7.50.

In this book the author gives a careful and well-documented account of the work of the great German preacher Schleiermacher, the earliest of whose sermons is dated in 1789 and the latest 1834, the year of his death. His active life thus covered the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods, and he was the contemporary of Kant. Schleiermacher was the ideal "liberal" preacher of the philosophical school then dominant in Church and State. Thus he tends to look upon Christianity as the comple-

ment and completion of natural human culture and civilization. European civilization, then afresh emerging from war and revolution, was, if not exactly Christian, on the way to become so. Theologically stated, his position was that as Christ had at the Incarnation entered into human civilization, the whole human race, believing or not, church-going or not, had been redeemed. It was only left to the Church to make the religious life, that is the religious side of civilization, conscious of itself, and this was the task *par excellence* of the preacher. Consonantly with this outlook Schleiermacher, while not explicitly denying miracle and the supernatural, relegated it, together with all eschatological conceptions of Christianity, to a very subordinate place. It was altogether unimportant. Consequently, again, Schleiermacher disparaged the historical element; he laid no stress on the synoptic Gospels and considered the "timeless eternal life" which he found in St. John more to his purpose. His sermons sought nothing from the Old Testament, nor had he any doctrine of Sacraments or of the Church as such, opposed to the world.

The author of this work, while fully recognizing the elevation of thought and the learning with which Schleiermacher presents his case, points out its many weaknesses. Judging it from the standpoint of Barth, who of course emphasizes the revelational and transcendent character of Christianity, he shows that its inherent optimism is too easy and too shallow to fit in with the facts of life, with the darkness of the world without God, with the terrors of death and the degradation of sin. The conception of God as a God of Law and of Judgment is integral to the Christian message and is, in fact, part of the Word of God which is proclaimed in the Gospel and which it is the special work of the Christian preacher to present anew to every generation.

W. R. V. BRADE.

JESUS. By A. E. Baker. The Centenary Press, 1933. 7s. 6d.

It is a fitting tribute to the Oxford Movement, on the part of the Centenary Press, that one of its first publications should be a study of the Jesus of History written by a parish priest for the more intelligent men and women to whom parish priests minister: and fitting that, in undertaking this study, the author should have attempted (in the words of his publisher) to bring "the method and spirit of New Testament criticism to the study of the Gospels" without hesitating to broach, at times, quite fundamental Christological problems. It is significant that laymen should be fearlessly confronted with theological issues; that criticism should be recognized as the handmaid of devotion; that the Jesus we worship should be shown us without our being first told to stifle our intellectual curiosity and to suppress our previous critical knowledge. But a book written on these lines, however loudly it may affirm that it is not written for "theological or historical experts," must, by its very nature, lay itself open to criticism from the points of view of theology and of criticism as well as of devotion.

Let it be said at once, however, that from the purely devotional point of view, which is, no doubt, supremely important, this book should provoke the gratitude of all parish priests. Its scheme is simple and yet comprehensive. Jesus is seen in His dealings with various persons or classes: His Mother—the Baptist—Satan—His Disciples—the Common People—the Elders and Chief Priests and Scribes. Finally, there are chapters on the origin of the Gospels and the Two Natures.

Such a scheme enables the author to handle a large amount of the Gospel material, setting it firmly in historical perspective, yet the while drawing out its significance with the more force for the modern reader because it is mediated through a concrete relation between Jesus and concrete surroundings. So we see Jesus in Galilee and in Jerusalem from various but definite points of view, and, as we move through the book from one point of view to another, sometimes, perhaps, returning more than once to one same word or incident, we gather fresh insight into our Subject and delve more deeply into the riches of His Revelation. And all the while we are carried along quite effortlessly by the author's flexible style. At times, indeed, his rhetoric has a compelling beauty and vitality, which suggests the preacher or the leader of meditation. This is worthy of note, for by its form as well as by its matter the book commends itself not only for reading, but for reading aloud, as well as a basis for meditation.

Yet it is apparent that, in spite of his claim to write "in the light of the modern scientific study of Christian origins" (p. 5), the author is not at ease with Biblical Criticism. From time to time, for instance, he makes silly little superior gibes at New Testament critics. "I accept the methods of historical and literary critics, but I do not accept their results. That, indeed, would be impossible, for they do not agree among themselves" (p. 5). "Some modern critics deny the authenticity of this parable [the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen], not on any evidence (the parable is in all three synoptics), but because in this story Jesus said things that He ought not to have said, according to them" (p. 189). This is not only cheap, self-conscious, and uncharitable: it very palpably begs a question. That a parable is "in all three synoptics" does not rule out the possibility of there being other evidence for doubting its authenticity. Is it, for instance, quite illegitimate to question whether Jesus really sent evil spirits into swine, or whether He really quoted Isaiah to show that He was deliberately speaking in parables in order that those who heard Him might not understand? If what is common to all three synoptics, that is to say the Marcan material, is to be immune from criticism, why does the author trouble to establish the value of the other three strata (p. 214)? Again, "There is evidence . . . that [the two commandments] had been put together before the time of Jesus, so there is no reason to doubt Luke's account" [of the Lawyer who questioned Jesus] (p. 189). Why should this follow, unless Mr. Baker is able to make it quite clear that Luke *never* set words of Jesus in a framework of narrative, or in some other relevant context except when his source bade him do so?

Mr. Baker is uneasy, and his uneasiness betrays itself in a longing for a concrete historical background. So ingenious suggestions like that of Dr. Burkitt's that Hosanna means "Up with your green boughs" are acceptable. This can do little harm. But it is surely harmful to assume without question that the Marcan chronology of the Passion is correct and so to reconstruct the Last Supper, in the light of much archæological guess-work, on the basis of the Passover meal. And it is dangerous to suggest that the disciples on the road to Emmaus recognized Jesus "in the breaking of bread" because "He seems to have had His own characteristic way of saying a blessing." For to fasten upon details in this fashion is to exclude at once all possibility of theological significance. And this is surely historically unjustifiable. For the historical fact is

not the background of identifiable detail, but the Christology which forced out conflicting chronologies and luminously allusive incidents. It may be the fact that the Last Supper took place at the time of the Passover—or it may be that Jesus died as the lambs were being slain for the Passover. Our Gospels show us that to understand the significance of the Last Supper and the Death we need the significance of both coincidences—and more! To fasten upon the one of them, then, is to defraud the Gospel. Similarly, to exclude the possibility that Luke had in mind the Christian knowledge of Christ in the Eucharist by conjuring up an imaginary mannerism as a sufficient explanation is to drop the substance for the shadow.

This tendency comes to a head in Mr. Baker's treatment of the Fourth Gospel. When will our would-be conservatives discover that in stubbornly revealing the identity of him whom the author—and this is particularly true if the author *was* John the son of Zebedee—deliberately made anonymous as "that disciple whom Jesus loved" they are not only committing an impertinence but are quite possibly obscuring the fuller meaning of the history which, as the author saw, was more than history, and which, consequently, he could try to express only by avoiding historical identification?

Mr. Baker, while speaking of the results of "the most modern study of the gospels" (p. 208), everywhere thinks fit to ignore Form-Criticism, which he does not even trouble to dismiss. It is difficult to understand why, for Form-Criticism reaffirms the complete interdependence of the accounts of the Historic Jesus and the worshipping Church, and so excludes the Liberal assumption of a Church which at first did not worship. This book consequently loses conviction because of its author's caution. One instance of this will suffice. The *pericope* of the Woman taken in Adultery demands, according to the method of Form-Criticism (see Vincent Taylor: *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, p. 83 f.), by reason of its very form, recognition as primitive. Mr. Baker has, as it were, to apologize for commenting on this incident on the grounds that "nobody of that age is known with imagination sufficiently daring and insight sufficiently certain to have invented it" (p. 135). Subjective argument of this sort no longer convinces the intelligent layman. One is bound to ask, therefore, whether the whole scheme of seeing the words and actions of Jesus through their historical framework—brilliantly as Mr. Baker carries it out—is not ultimately a dangerous limitation of the Word of God which the form of the synoptic material and the insight of the author of the Fourth Gospel—dare we say providentially?—made scientifically inadequate.

A similar inconsistency is apparent in Mr. Baker's theology. This is difficult to assess, since it is largely introduced in short didactic judgments (e.g., p. 134: "The vocation of Jesus was to establish the Reign of God in men's hearts and lives") which are scattered throughout the book. Sometimes he shows much insight: "The God who is revealed in the life and suffering and death of Jesus, and in the manner of His resurrection, is recognizably the same God as is immanent in the long tragedy of the world's slow achievement of freedom and perfection" (p. 233). But set this by the side of: "This awful cry [My God, my God . . .] was unanswered; perhaps because in all His affliction the Father was afflicted. This must be part, at least, of the meaning of calling Jesus the Son, and calling God the Father. Always the Father was there with Him, bearing His

part. He was overwhelmed with Him, bore the last agony, the last loneliness. God, like Jesus, could not take care of Himself. *He saved others, Himself He could not save.* He is love" (pp. 111, 112). No other explanation of the climax of the Atonement save this, with its curious savour of patripassianism. Such treatment suggests that the author has thought more about the Incarnation than about the Crucifixion and Resurrection, and that it is not Catholic theology, but his conception of the meaning of Love, which is guiding his exegesis. Would a really loyal study of the New Testament permit either of these tendencies?

None the less, we must be grateful for this book: it is full of most suggestive exegesis and at least points the way to a life of Jesus, based on fearless study, which will compel men to fall at His feet and cry with St. Thomas (another searcher after the historic fact), "My Lord and my God!"

NOEL DAVEY.

THE FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL TRADITION. By Vincent Taylor. Macmillan, 1933. 7s. 6d.

For various reasons the method of New Testament study generally known as Form-Criticism has not only taken some time to become understood and used in England by any save a few specialized scholars, but has aroused a certain distrustful and even hostile prejudice among some of those who teach and expound the Scriptures. This ignorance and prejudice is understandable, and, perhaps, to some extent excusable. On the one hand, Form-Criticism did not come into being through the work of one man only, or of one school only, but spontaneously, from several sources at once. Accordingly, the overlapping terms and results of the pioneers necessarily seemed at first, at any rate to foreign readers, chaotic and mutually contradictory. Moreover, none of the books in which the various methods were first put forward, if only because it was necessarily experimental, was suitable for translation. On the other hand, rumour asserted that the new method reduced the authentic sayings of Jesus to one or two, and this, and other half-truths, made it possible for the cautious to caricature it as absurd, or to damn it as the outcome of subjective motive- and parallel-hunting. Dr. Easton and Dr. Lowther Clarke have both, it is true, done much to allay such suspicions as these. But although Dr. Lowther Clarke saw that the *formgeschichtliche* method had come to stay, and was able to conclude that though it "had been used to support very sceptical conclusions" that is "no argument against its intrinsic value," and although Dr. Easton supplied sufficient information about the method to enable English scholars to test it for themselves, it is, I think, fair to say that both gave the impression of an irksome, laborious, destructive, and largely untenable criticism which we must face and from which we must expect to receive little—and this just as we were building four-document edifices on top of our now firmly established two-document foundation.

Dr. Vincent Taylor has now published in very attractive and readable form the results of what has evidently been a careful and extended study of the method of Form-Criticism. His book is an achievement for which we have all been waiting; or rather, it would be truer to say, his book combines several achievements for which we have been waiting. It will become invaluable to more than one class of New Testament student for these, and perhaps other, reasons.

1. It contains an adequate and lucid statement of the history of the *formgeschichtliche* school and a sufficient description of the method of each of its pioneers, yet so arranges its exposition that it is centred upon the actual material and thus avoids giving an impression of chaos and contradiction.

2. It examines the technical terms used in Germany and suggests English terms which are not slavish equivalents for those used by any one writer and which, arising as they do from a knowledge of all, may well provide English scholars with a standard vocabulary for future use. At all events, they relieve us of the bondage of italicized and unpronounceable transliterations.

3. It does not hesitate to set forth complete lists of the various kinds of material so that, quite apart from the value of the author's own discussion and conclusions, it should be valuable as a starting-point for the student using Form-Criticism in the same way as *Horæ Synopticæ* and *The Four Gospels* are for students using source-criticism. (As a result of reading this book I am hoping to have time to mark a Greek Testament and so to add to my *apparatus criticus* a volume that will show me "form at a glance.")

4. Throughout, the book is constructive, and while he does not hesitate to criticize the results claimed by some German scholars, the author is quite obviously more concerned to use Form-Criticism fearlessly and confidently than to shatter the exaggerations naturally committed, in their enthusiasm, by its first exponents. Hence I dare to prophesy that readers will put it down with much more interest in, and sympathy for, Form-Criticism, than they had when they took it up.

5. Dr. Vincent Taylor does not omit to show that Form-Criticism only clarifies and prepares material for the historical critic and, beyond him, for the theologian. It is important that Form-Criticism should be introduced to us by one who is not only conscious of its limitations as a science, but is conscious too that the problem which has really provoked its appearance—Christ and the Church—is not soluble by the mere study of form, although the study of form bears witness to it.

6. In an excellent concluding chapter Dr. Vincent Taylor applies what he quite rightly lays down as an essential test of the results of historical study. He traces the story of what he calls "The Emergence of the Gospels." It is perhaps a pity that his account of the "second period" has to include an examination of the evidences for complexes of material bearing signs of literary compilation before they were used by Mark. It would have been more satisfactory had this been worked out beforehand, in the body of the book, so as to set this chapter free from all argument of the sort that requires reference to passages of Scripture. But, even if this is a fair criticism of what may have been, after all, perhaps difficult to arrange otherwise, this last chapter is a valuable and suggestive reconstruction, which should amply justify its author's hope that it may open out "possibilities which enrich our knowledge of the tradition and its history."

Such are, perhaps, some of the more important results of Dr. Vincent Taylor's work. But the whole book is full of statements which are suggestive because they appear not so much as final conclusions (as the statements of source criticism so often did), but as pointers to further study and thought. Here is a judgment upon Q which is very different from the disillusioned scepticism with which it has sometimes been dismissed of late:

The delusion that prevents all progress is the assumption that Q remained one and the same entity over a number of years. It is because this is so often assumed that critical views are so various: the investigators describe the source at different points in its complex history. Although Q was the work of an individual, it was rooted in the life of primitive Christianity, and its fortunes must have reflected the circumstances of its origins: it changed, as it was bound to change, because it was responsive to the life it fed (p. 182).

Are we lightly to dismiss the "life" that gave birth to Q—and fed upon it?

Or again, when asking "why the Resurrection-tradition consisted of isolated stories, when the Passion Stories were early and continuous in form," Dr. Vincent Taylor points out that the assurance of the fact was fundamental for the first Christians, and that the need for a continuous story did not arise, a selection of stories of Appearances alone being felt necessary (see pp. 59-62)—yet it was the fact established by the Resurrection appearances which necessitated the preaching of a continuous story of the Passion, and, eventually, the whole concentration upon the pre-Crucifixion Life of Jesus (it is significant that the Fourth Gospel exhibits no tendency to place lengthy discourses in the mouth of the Risen Lord)! How vitally important it is for theology that Form-Criticism should lead those who use it to come upon tremendously significant facts such as this!

NOEL DAVEY.

FULFILLING THE MINISTRY. By the late S. K. Knight, Bishop of Jarrow. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

In this book the late Bishop of Jarrow has revised and expanded the Pastoral Lectures he delivered in Cambridge, 1925-1926. Written in lucid style, the work reveals wide experience and deep reading in all branches of parochialia, and we can sincerely recommend it both to ordinands and to clergy. The lectures on Priests, Prophets, Pastors, and Teachers are excellent. In the earlier ones the lecturer has attempted to cover too wide an area with the result that great themes are dismissed in paragraphs. Take, for example, Lecture II., headed "The Church of England," occupying twenty-six pages, which has as sub-headings—National Churches, Church and State, Ordination Vows, A Comprehensive Church, Uniformity, Obedience to Authority, The Appeal to Reason, The Appeal to the Scriptures, The Appeal to the Primitive Church, The Enabling Act, Other Communion, The Privilege of Ministry in the Church of England.

The outlook is that of the best type of moderate Anglicanism—sane, broad-minded, sincere, together with a certain vagueness and a marked distrust of any departure from the *via media*. There is an honest effort to reckon with the pressing problems of modern Church life, and the greatest of these is the shortage of clergy. Within a decade this difficulty has entirely changed its character. A few years ago the source of the trouble was the meagre supply of ordinands, now it is the lack of funds to pay for the services of assistant clergy. Dr. Knight admits the impossibility of house-to-house visiting in populous parishes when the clerical staff is inadequate to meet the situation, but still urges that it should be kept as the goal and that no pains should be spared to reach it as

completely as possible. From this view we entirely dissent. Such counsel loads the clergy, already in a desperate plight, with a burden which can only make them fulfil their misery rather than their ministry. We do not believe that a huge number of ten-minutes visits once a year to indifferent households justifies the expenditure of so much energy. Souls cannot be converted or even strengthened by such encounters. The priest's first and foremost duty is to collect around him a body of faithful people infused with the evangelical spirit who will see that the first duty of converted souls is to strengthen their brethren and "compel them to come in." Africa can only be converted by the Africans, we are told. Similarly, artisans will only be converted through artisans—shop girls through shop girls, etc. The need in the Church today is not for the clergy to be rushing wildly round in the vain endeavour to reach a goal which they know to be unattainable, but to be praying, studying, preaching, teaching with the definite and practical aim of building up a strong band of missionary-hearted people equipped with the requisite spiritual and intellectual weapons to carry on an active campaign in the service of Christ—in a word, to be His faithful *soldiers*. The "littleness" of the flock of faithful churchgoers in these days is a God-given occasion to the clergy of instilling into each of them the sense of personal vocation and boundless opportunity. To us it seems that the clergy and wardens are capable of transacting the business normally done by the Parochial Church Council, but that they are incapable of grappling with the spiritual problem in large parishes, and that therefore the P.C.C.'s foremost duty is spiritual and not financial business.

The P.C.C. should be primarily an evangelical council. Whatever may be said for the house-to-house method, the alternative scheme has the advantage of being our Lord's own.

The practical experiences of priests best qualified to judge in such matters as frequent communion, regular confession, Eucharistic worship in its relation to communion, will differ from the Bishop of Jarrow's theories. In dealing with a subject of such wide range as the Christian Ministry, it is inevitable that the writer should have to touch on controversial topics, but there is very much in this book that is admirable and indisputable, and it so obviously comes from the hand of a devoted and faithful minister of Christ.

C. C. H. JAMES.